



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:


- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search


Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

B 451541


THE POPE THE KINGS & THE PEOPLE



William Shirer








BX
830
1869
A79

THE POPE THE KINGS AND THE PEOPLE



THE POPE THE KINGS AND THE PEOPLE

A HISTORY OF THE MOVEMENT TO MAKE

THE POPE GOVERNOR OF THE WORLD

BY A UNIVERSAL

3-83-90-

RECONSTRUCTION OF SOCIETY

FROM THE ISSUE OF THE SYLLABUS TO THE CLOSE OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL

By WILLIAM ARTHUR

'Take thou the tiara adorned with the triple crown, and know that thou art the Father of
princes and of kings, and art the Governor of the world.'

Coronation Service of the Pontiffs

VOL. II.



WILLIAM MULLAN & SON

34 PATERNOSTER ROW LONDON

4 DONEGAL PLACE BELFAST

1877

Hazell, Watson, and Viney, Printers, London and Aylesbury.

CONTENTS.

BOOK III.

FROM THE OPENING OF THE COUNCIL TO THE INTRODUCTION OF THE QUESTION OF INFALLIBILITY.

CHAPTER I.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| The First Session, Dec. 8th, 1869, or Opening Ceremony—Mustering—Robing—The Procession—The Anthem and Mass—The Sermon—The Act of Obedience—The Allocution—The Incensing—Passing Decrees—The <i>Tv Deum</i> —Appreciations of various Witnesses | 1 |

CHAPTER II.

| | |
|--|----|
| First Proceedings—Unimportant Committees and All-Important Commissions—No Council if Pope dies—Theologians discover their Disfranchisement—Father Ambrose—Parties and Party Tactics—Were the Bishops Free Legislators?—Plans of Reconstruction—Plan of the German Bishops—Segesser's Plan—New Bull of Excommunications | 45 |
|--|----|

CHAPTER III.

| | |
|--|----|
| Further Party Manoeuvres—Election of Permanent Committees—Bull of Excommunications—Various opinions of it—Position of Antonelli—No serious Discussion desired—Perplexities of the Bishops—Reissach's Code suppressed—It may reappear—Attitude of Governments | 72 |
|--|----|

CHAPTER IV.

| | |
|--|-----|
| First open Collisions of Opinion—Pending Debate—Fear of an Acclamation—Rauscher opens—Kenrick—Tizzani—General discontent with the Draft—Vacant Hats—Speaking by Rank—Strossmayer—No permission to read the Reports, even of their own Speeches—Conflicting Views—Petitions to Pope from Bishops—Homage of Science—Theism | 100 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER V.

| | |
|--|-----|
| The Second Public Session—Swearing a Creed never before known in a General Council—Really an Oath including Feudal Obedience | 123 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER VI.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Speech of the Pope against the Opposition—Future Policy set before France—Count Armin's Views—Resumed Debate—Haynald—A New Mortal Sin—Count Daru and French Policy—Address calling for the New Dogma—Counter Petitions against the Principle as well as the Opportuneness | 137 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER VII.

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Matters of Discipline—Remarks of Friedrich on the Morals of the Clergy— Also on the War against Modern Constitutions—Morality of recent Jesuit Teaching—Darboy's Speech—Melcher's Speech—A Dinner Party of Fallibilists—One of Infallibilists—Gratry—Debate on the Morals of the Clergy | PAGE 158 |
|---|-------------|

CHAPTER VIII.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Church and State—Draft of Decrees with Canons—Gains Publicity—Prin- ciples involved—Views of Liberal Catholics—The Papal View of the Means of Resistance possessed by Governments | 180 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER IX.

| | |
|--|-----|
| The Courts of Vienna and Paris manifest Anxiety—Disturbances in Paris —Daru's Letters—Beust moves—His Despatches—His Passage of Arms with Antonelli—Daru's Despatch and Antonelli's Reply—Daru's Rejoinder—Beust lays down the Course which Austria will follow— Arnim's Despatch—The <i>Unitá</i> on the Situation—Veuillot on the Situation—Satisfaction of the Ultramontanes | 191 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER X.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Personal Attack on Dupanloup—Attempts at a Compromise—Impossi- bility of now retreating—Daru Resigns—Olivier's Policy—Feeling that the Proceedings must be Shortened—The Episode of the Patriarch of Babylon—Proposal for a New Catechism—Michaud on Changes in Catechism—The Rules revised—An Archbishop stopped—Protest of One Hundred Bishops—Movement of Sympathy with Döllinger—The Pope's Chat—Pope and M. de Falloux—Internal Struggle of Friedrich | 208 |
|--|-----|

BOOK IV.

FROM THE INTRODUCTION OF THE QUESTION OF INFALLIBILITY TO THE
SUSPENSION OF THE COUNCIL.

CHAPTER I.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Joy of Don Margotti—New Feelers for an Acclamation—Suggested Model of the Scene—Its Political Import—A Pause—Case of the Jesuit Kleutgen—Schwarzenberg out of Favour—Politics of Poland— Döllinger on the New Rules—Last Protest of Montalembert—His Death—Consequent Proceedings in Rome | 233 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER II.

| | |
|---|--|
| Threat of American Prelates—Acclamation again fails—New Protest—De- crees on Dogma—Ingenious connection of Creation with the Curia —Serious Allegations of Unfair and Irregular Proceedings of the Officials—Fears at the Opening of the New Session—The Three Devo- tions of Rome—More Hatred of Constitutions—Noisy Sitting; Stross- mayer put down—The Pope's Comments—He compares the Opposition | |
|---|--|

Contents.

vii

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| to Pilate and to the Freemasons—He is reconciled to Mérode—The Idea of Charlemagne—Secret Change of a Formula before the Vote | 245 |
| CHAPTER III. | |
| Important Secret Petition of Rauscher and others—Clear Statement of Political Bearings of the Question—A Formal Demand that the Question whether Power over Kings and Nations was given to Peter shall be argued—Complaints of Manning—Dr. Newman's Letter—The <i>Civilità</i> exorcises Newman—Veuillot's Gibes at him—Conflicts with the Orientals—Armenians in Rome attacked by the Police—Priests arrested—Broil in the Streets—Convent placed under Interdict—Third Session—Forms—Decrees unanimously adopted—Their Extensive Practical Effects | 260 |
| CHAPTER IV. | |
| To the end of the General Debate on the Decrees <i>De Ecclesia</i> , June 3rd—Temporal Benefit to the Curia of Spiritual Centralisation—Spalding's Proposals—Impatience of the Pope and Veuillot—Outcry against <i>Ce Qui se Passe au Concile</i> —All other Subjects to be Postponed, and Infallibility to be brought on out of its order—Renewed protest of Minority—Open Change of Dispute from one on Opportuneness to one on the Merits of the Dogma—Aneadotes of Bishops—Violations of Rules—Private Notes of Bishops on the Dogma—Doubts cast on the Authority of the Council—Formula of New Decree—How it will Work | 282 |
| CHAPTER V. | |
| The Great Debate—Bishop Pie—The Virgin Mary on Infallibility—Cullen claims Ireland and MacHale—Kenrick's Reply, and his Account of the first Introduction of the Doctrine into Maynooth—MacHale speaks—Full Report of Darboy's Speech—The Pope gives Signs of Pleasure at Saldanha's Assault on the King of Portugal—New Date fixed for the Great Definition — Manning's Great Speech — Remarkable Reply of Kenrick—McEvilly ascribes Catholic Emancipation not to the Effect of Oaths, but to that of the Fear of Civil War—Kenrick's Retort—Clifford against Manning—Verot's Scene—Spalding's Attack on Kenrick—Kenrick's Refutation—Speeches of Valerga, Purcell, Conolly, and Maret—Sudden Close of the Debate | 306 |
| CHAPTER VI. | |
| To the Close of the Special Debate on Infallibility, July 4th—Proposal of the Minority to resist—They yield once more—Another Protest—Efforts to procure Unanimity—Hope of the Minority in Delay—Pope disregards the Heat—Disgrace of Theiner—Decree giving to Pope ordinary Jurisdiction everywhere—His Superiority to Law—Debate on Infallibility—Speech of Guidi—Great Emotion—Scene with the Pope—Close of the Debate—Present view of the <i>Civilità</i> as to Politics—Specimens of the Official Histories—Exultation | 334 |
| CHAPTER VII. | |
| To the Eve of the Great Session, July 18th—A Fresh Shock for the Opposition—Serious Trick of the Presidents and Committee—Outcry of the | |

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| French Bishops—Proposal to Quit the Council—They send in another Protest—What is Protestantism?—Immediate War not foreseen—Contested Canon adopted—The Bishops threatened—Hasty Proceedings—Final Vote on the Dogma—Unexpected Firmness of the Minority—Effect of the Vote—Deputation to the Pope—His incredible Prevarication—Ketteler's Scene—Counter Deputation of Manning and Senestrey—Vast Changes in the Decrees made in a Moment—Petty Condemnations—The Minority files | 362 |
| CHAPTER VIII. | |
| Grief of M. Veuillot—Final Deputation and Protest | 392 |
| CHAPTER IX. | |
| From the Great Session to the Suspension of the Council, October 20th, 1870—The Time now come for the Fulfilment of Promises—Position and Prospects—Second Empire and Papacy fall together—Style of Address to the Pope—War for the Papal Empire Foreshadowed—Latest Act of the Council—Italy moves on Rome—Capture of the City—Suspension of the Council—Attitude of the Church changed—Last Events of 1870 | 415 |
| CHAPTER X. | |
| How far has the Vatican Movement been a Success, and how far a Failure?—As to Measures of the Nature of Means a Success—As to Measures of the Nature of Ends hitherto a Failure—Testimony of Liberal Catholics to the one, and of Ultramontanes to the other—Apparatus of Means in Operation for the Ultimate End of Universal Dominion—Story of Scherr as an Example of the Minority—Different Classes of those who 'Submit'—Condition and Prospects of the Two Powers in Italy—Proximate Ends at present aimed at—Control of Elections—Of the Press—Of Schools—Problem of France and Italy—Power of the Priests for Disturbance—Comparison between Catholic and Non-Catholic Nations for last Sixty Years—Are Priests capable of fomenting Anarchical Plots?—Hopes of Ultramontanes rest on France and England—The Former for Military Service, the Latter for Converts—This Hope Illusory | 444 |
| <hr/> | |
| APPENDIX C. | |
| The Constitutions ' <i>Dei Filius</i> ' and ' <i>Pastor Eternus</i> ' | 503 |
| <hr/> | |
| APPENDIX D. | |
| The Pope personally preparing Children for War | 519 |
| <hr/> | |
| INDEX | 520 |

Dec 1869

BOOK III.

*FROM THE OPENING OF THE COUNCIL TO THE INTRODUCTION
OF THE QUESTION OF INFALLIBILITY.*

CHAPTER I.

The First Session, Dec. 8th, 1869, or Opening Ceremony—Mustering—Robing—The Procession—The Anthem and Mass—The Sermon—The Act of Obedience—The Allocution—The Incensing—Passing Decrees—The *Tv Deum*—Appreciations of various Witnesses.

AT dawn, on Wednesday December 8th, 1869, the guns of Fort St. Angelo saluted the long looked for day, while from the other side of the Tiber those of the Aventine replied. The bellowing of these beasts of war awoke the city to witness a Council of the ministers of peace. As the sounds reached the ear of peasant, monk, and nun, already plodding in the dark from places outside the walls, the sky was low, and pouring down a truly Roman rain. Unlike towns round which smiling homes are sown broadcast outside of the bounds, Rome, when approached by most of the routes, first shows the city walls, and not till a good while later does it show the beginning of habitations. The poor suburbs which lie outside a few of the gates are less dreary than the space inside, where lonely roads, shut in by blank walls, lead amidst crumbling mementoes of rulers of the world, and marks of the actual reign of drones not able to master ordinary difficulties. Every now and then comes a church, or one of the two hundred and more convents and nunneries which sanctify the place. But scarcely any of

these have an outline such as to yield, in twilight, the effect of either Gothic spires or Moorish minarets, or even of good Grecian colonnades.

Many a cowled figure struggled under the drenching rain along these desolate ways. One would pass the spot where Peter was arrested by his Master, when the Fisherman uttered the famous 'Lord, whither goest Thou?' and was turned back to Rome to die. Another would pass by the vale of Egeria, and he might well wonder if Numa ever had to seek inspiration there in such dismal gloom. If the monk knew sufficient of the local history, he might again wonder how tradition should, for ages, have gone so utterly wrong as to the site of that sacred spot, connected in the *origines sacrae* of Rome with the movements, not of a poor Jew stranger, but of a native king. However, that was tradition unbaptized; it was neither apostolic nor ecclesiastical. Crossing the open ground about the Lateran, some of the monks might think of the terrible morn when Totila, in mercy, halted his troops inside the gates, sending the clang of his trumpets through the dark, all over the city, to give the wretched Romans the chance of flight.

One may even fancy an old and somewhat conservative monk passing the Lateran basilica, with the prospect of a long wet trudge before him, asking, Why should they not hold the Council here? This, he might say, is, according to Rome, 'the mother and mistress of all churches.' Here the ancient Councils used to meet; for to such a monk those Roman synods would be General Councils, and even ancient ones. True, he might add, the Holy Father declares that they now meet at the Vatican, because of the wholesome influence which emanates from the grave of St. Peter. Still, the monk might think, it must be from the person of St. Peter that the inspiration flows, and we have here in the Lateran the head of the Prince of the Apostles. Is not the head more than the trunk, which is all they have at St. Peter's? We are going

away from the head, to seek inspiration from the headless trunk ! Is not this, however, a proof that those wretched Liberal Catholics are in gross error when they accuse the Holy Father of intending, by this Vatican Council, to absorb the powers of the body of the Church into the head ? Had a disciple of the former Rector of St. Maria Maddalena heard the soliloquy, he would have replied, Yes, brother, you are doing to-day what those who follow the Popes have done for ages,—you are turning away from the head to seek inspiration from the lifeless trunk. You can gain only infected air.

Other monks coming from St. Agnese, and entering by the Porta Pia, would reflect upon the adornment of that gate by the Holy Father, and upon its happy name which links it both with Pius IX. and with its own founder. Its founder, Pius IV., signed the Creed of the Council of Trent, and Pius IX. was to sign the new Creed of the Council of the Vatican. This beautiful coincidence would, with the monks, make the gate an emblem of the Church, against which the gates of hell should never prevail. If they only happened to recollect that its old name *Nomentana* marked it as the Mentana Gate, the encouraging impression would rise almost to the brightness of a revelation. The day, only two years before, when the conquering crusaders marched in, and the welkin rang with shouts of ‘Long live Pius IX.!’ ‘Long live the zouaves! ’ ‘Long live the Crusaders! ’ ‘Long live Catholic France! ’ would return to memory as the pledge of mightier Mentanas. Had an invisible hand drawn aside the veil, and shown them that gate, some nine months later, admitting the Italian troops, followed by the dog Pio drawing a little cart full of Bibles ; and then shown, still later, the residence of a British Ambassador to the King of Italy inside the gate, and on the outside the residence of Garibaldi, the monks would have vowed by all the saints, old and new, that the vision came from a lying spirit.

Some, again, crossing the Tiber by the Milvian Bridge,

would, in spite of the blinding rain, see the figure of Constantine victoriously dominating the heights, and that of Maxentius being hurled into the stream. A while afterwards, when passing near the Broken Wall, where St. Peter himself had kept watch, and with his own hand had blinded and routed the Goths, they would feel that now when his successor was to be at last duly exalted, the Apostle would surely keep the city more jealously than before ; and if there was need of a Belisarius to crush the Italian barbarians, the Lord would raise him up at the intercession of Peter.

In the opposite quarter, those coming from the desolate St. Paul's would, on approaching the city, be reminded of that hateful moment in the October night of 1867, when the gate was, for a while, held by the Garibaldians. But the monks would say, Did not the *Civiltá* express it charmingly ?—‘The Garibaldians would have made a pretty omelette ; but would St. Peter resign his office ? or would the Lord give up His place to the devil ? The good God is always there, and St. Peter goes round with his great keys, and gives knocks like those of a club ’ (VII., vii., 427).

As they came further inwards, the crowds of the city were already in motion. Down from the Cœlian and Esquiline were they pouring past the Coliseum, reflecting men delighting in the thought that all high things which exalt themselves against the Church would fall into her power just as the Coliseum had done ; for the ‘high things’ of the Romanised imagination are naturally material ones. The Arch of Titus, darkly outlined in the morning grey, would be the prophetic pledge that the Jews, however stubborn, would yield to the Pontiff at last. But where was the golden candlestick—where the temple vessels ? After Genseric carried them off, had they ever returned ? The ruinous Palatine would symbolise woes coming to modern Cæsars, as sure as those which had crushed the ancient ones. Indeed, it is not impossible that some would see visions like those seen by monks of yore, who

beheld the soul of the great Theodoric dragged into the crater of Stromboli. On the other hand, it is conceivable that some reading monk, in passing the site of the Lupercal, might ask if the tale of Romulus and Remus was really open to doubt; and if so, what of the ship of *Aeneas*, so long and so perfectly preserved? Then, if Rome had twice built history on fragile materials—on a ship that perhaps never sailed, and on a wolf that perhaps never did give suck to the twins—what if heretics should say that she had built a third time, on a chair in which the Fisherman never sat? And if Rome under Augustus had penned prophecies, dating them from the time of *Aeneas*, might not the like have happened again? A larger number of monks have thoughts of this sort than the outside world knows of. Some might even go so far as to ask, If the fable of Pope Joan, the fair and frail English-woman, could be wrought into the beliefs, books, and usages—the very coronation usages—of Rome, long after the Papacy had become the ruling power of the city, who is to answer for traditions of the underground age before Constantine?

From the Aventine, where Peter resided with Priscilla and Aquila, and which is now little but a site for monastic establishments, many would come, passing by the place where once stood the Circus Maximus. The thoughtful would there have in their eye the grand spectacles of Pagan Rome. It was by a spectacle that Romulus allured the Sabines to unity by violence; and it was by a spectacle that Pius IX. was now wooing the world to wedlock with the Papacy—ready, if only able, to take short measures with the coy. But what were the shows of the old rude times to this? What if three hundred thousand pairs of eyes did gleam together on the spectacles which, with bread, made up the earthly all of the Roman *plebs*? They never had looked upon such an array of holy bishops, from the whole earth, as would be seen to-day. The colours for which they went mad, their idolized blues and greens, were but few, and ill-combined, compared with the

6 *The Pope, the Kings, and the People.*

colours now about to be displayed. The ancient cry ‘Bread and Spectacles!’ was indeed still kept alive by Roman authorities, but was to-day to be satisfied in a Christian style glorious beyond Pagan example.

Along the Via Sacra few foreigners would appear, but from the Capitoline Germans would set out. It is natural to think of some student, fresh from the pages of Gregorovius, his imagination vividly setting face to face the ancient Rome and the actual. He would think of the exclamation, ‘Renowned, queenly, immeasurable Rome, a sea of beauty surpassing all power of speech!’ Where were the glory and the beauty now? Inside the churches and palaces indeed were masses of decoration and artistic stores of wealth, but the city viewed, on that dismal December morning, as a city, was poor and ill kept. The glory which once compelled men at this central point to call her Golden Rome was departed. What now represented the Temple of Jupiter—its pillars on gilded bases with gilded capitals, its gates of gilded bronze, and its roof of tiles of gilded brass? There stands the Church of the Araceli; Jupiter is succeeded by the Bambino, a doll, carved by St. Luke, which is driven in a stately carriage round the city to the beds of the dying. The German student might be tempted to say that Jupiter was taking his revenge upon the Bambino by sending such a spiteful rain. Very probably, with all their learning, the German students would not know that the Bambino had lately been reinforced by the venerable Anna Maria Taigi.

Crossing the Bridge of Sixtus the student might see vividly, as students do, the scene of that sacrilegious morning when the lone old stream, with no Horatius now, was breasted by swarthy boatmen swinging the oar with the stroke of the rover, and as each galley shot out of the bend of the Aventine, the chief, from under his turban, eyed the opening prospect of plunder with the glance of an Ishmaelite. When they rifled the grave, would the student say, if they found anything of

the Fisherman, certainly they did not leave anything. If the ashes of Peter ever did rest there, were they not sent by the Saracens to await those of Wycliffe in the sea ?

A pamphlet, by a Hebrew, with the title of *The Ghetto and Rome's Great Show*, reminds us that from under the flank of the Capitoline some would come out of the pen in which the Popes had, for ages, shut up the children of Israel. No doubt some travelled Rabbi would do so. Such a man would have mentally dwelt all his life among the ancients, and personally he would have seen the Pyramids and Thebes, the Tomb of Abraham, with Jerusalem, Baalbec, and probably the Remains upon the Euphrates, if not those on the Tigris. To him Roman dates were modern, and Roman monuments, though great for Europe, were on a scale comparatively small, not equalling in magnitude those of Asia, not approaching in grace those of Hellas. In his eye all the princes of the ancient monarchies laughed at the notion of Gregorovius, that the idea of a world-empire originated with the Romans,—nay, no more than did the idea of the Trojan War.

Towards Pius IX. personally the feeling of the Jew would be rather kindly, for he, like Sixtus V., had relieved the Hebrews from some of the severities to which they had long been subjected by preceding Popes. But this would not prevent the whole tormented past from rising in memory before the Rabbi and stirring him to hope that he might now be going to witness the last show ever to be exhibited by one of the cruel race of the Pope-Kings. The pen in which his people had been shut up, the distinguishing badge, the differential taxes, the religious worry, and the manifold enormities committed upon them in the name of Christ who loved them, of Peter who lived for them, and of Paul who gave himself repeatedly to death for them, had long helped to set him and his on hating Christ, and Peter, and Paul. 'Hard as their lot was under the Cæsars,' says our pamphlet, 'it became harder still when the ecclesiastical Head was crowned by Pepin Le Bref,

king of the States of the Church, and actually ruler of the world.' The day was now past when the Corso, in carnival-time, rang with the shouts of so-called Christians, hailing the spectacle of Jews naked, except a girdle round the loins and ropes round their necks, forced to run races against riderless mules, and asses, and buffaloes. For a long time this service had been performed for the sacred city by riderless horses, goaded by spiked balls, slashing into their sides. Nevertheless, those former days would rise up before the Rabbi's eye, as would also the price paid for ransom. As he passed along, between him and the Corso stood the one pile still entire which to memory represented the Pagan Romanism under which his first ancestors in the city had suffered, and to the eye represented the Papal Romanism under which their descendants had continued for so many ages to groan. Dedicated by Agrippa to Cybele and all the gods, it had been rededicated by Boniface IV. to Mary and all the martyrs. Though still best known as the Pantheon, its name in Rome is St. Mary of the Rotunda.

Our Rabbi would naturally, on such an occasion, compare it as it had been and as it now is; for the associations of the day would suggest to his mind that gathering of the provincials in the plain of Dura, when some of his forefathers had to bear witness against the longing natural to those who imagine themselves heads of the human species, to set up new idols, and to insist on unity by means more urgent than godly. That was the first clearly recorded scene in the fiery drama of Catholic Unity; a unity bending, breaking, or burning all nations, peoples, and tongues into religious and political submission to one human head. Probably the Rabbi would admit that there was some ground of justice in the words of *Joseph De Maistre*, that the Pantheon had been devoted to all the vices, and now was devoted to all the virtues. Thus far the Christian element in Papal Romanism had asserted its moral superiority. But the Rabbi would feel that there

was exaggeration upon both sides of De Maistre's assertion. The gods of the Pagans were not all personified vices, any more than are now all those of the Hindus. Many of them were so, and that is enough. On the other hand, not all the saints of the Papal Pantheon represent personified virtues, judged by any code but the sad one of the Popes themselves. The Rabbi would hardly recognise St. Peter Arbues, red with the blood of thousands of the seed of Abraham, as one of the Virtues, any more than as one of the Graces. He would, however, recognise the correctness of Joseph De Maistre's estimate of the kind of change made by the Popes in the Pantheon. He would also admit the good judgment of M. Fisquet in selecting the following passage of De Maistre, when describing the ceremonies of Rome for Frond's history¹ :—

'It is in the Pantheon that Paganism is rectified and brought back to the primitive system, of which it is only a visible corruption. The name of God is exclusive and incommunicable. Nevertheless, there are many gods, in heaven and in earth. There are intelligences, better natures of deified men (*hommes divinisés*). The gods of Christianity are the saints. Around God are assembled ALL THE GODS, to serve Him in the place and order assigned to them.'

The Rabbi might say, The Law pulls down the word 'gods,' by applying it to magistrates, thus making it mean little; but these ignorant priests lift it up to mean something more than the Pagans ever did mean by it, as if the latter had imagined that each god was a supreme being, or something near it. De Maistre, however, had more sense. He knew that 'saints' was another name for gods, only they were not to be vicious, which was no doubt the original idea.²

¹ *Frond*, iii., p. 254. M. Fisquet is author of the work *Gallia Christiana*, in fifty volumes.

² The Hindu *Bhagavad Gita* thus represents the distinction between God and the gods. 'I behold, O God! within Thy heart the *devas* [gods] assembled, and every specific tribe of beings. I see Brahma [the creator, only a god] sitting on his lotus throne, all the Reeshees, and heavenly Ooragas. . . . I see Thee without beginning, without middle, and without end. . . . The space between the heavens and the earth is possessed by Thee alone, and every point

By this time, the dull and dripping air would begin to vibrate with the roll of carriages. Both in the rain and under cover, the throng was pouring towards one point. From the poor streets, where once stretched the glorious Fora of the Cæsars, from the old Suburra, from the regions covered by the gardens of Sallust, from the spot where the persecuting name of Diocletian and a splendid church are now locally associated, from all the flanks of the Quirinal, would the stream come pouring towards the old Field of Mars. Bishops, artists, and the models of the artists, priests and beggars, quaint peasants, handsome artisans, well-dressed tradesmen, pressed in slush and silence past the lone pillar of Trajan, nobly sad, standing amidst memories of might and signs of impotence. The French artists from the Villa Medici, English ones from the foot of the Pincio, German ones from various regions, all sped on, among the most eager; for to them, as to the priests, it was not a day merely of pleasure, but one also of work. The painter would hope to catch hints in colour and grouping, the sculptor to see heads that would do for a Moses or a Peter. Perhaps, some one might wonder if an effective frieze could be made out of the procession. Would there not be too much of clothes, and too little of either man or animal? As the artistic throng swept past St. Angelo's, many a sculptor would think

around. . . . Of the celestial bands, some fly to Thee for refuge; whilst some, afraid, with joined hands sing forth Thy praise. The Maharsheen holy bands hail Thee; and then follows an enumeration of various orders of celestials, who 'all stand gazing on Thee, all alike amazed.'*

While thus Hinduism long anticipated either Pagan or Papal Romanism, in a system of inferior worship to inferior powers, it more logically attached inferior paradises to such worship. 'Those who worship the *Devatas* [gods] go unto the *Devatas*; those who worship the Patriarchs go unto the Patriarchs; the servants of the spirits go to the spirits; and they who worship me go unto me.'[†] That is sensible as a polity, if fallen as a religion. But it may be doubtful whether those who worship the Inquisitors would like to go to the Inquisitora.

* Wilkins's translation, Garret's ed., pp. 54, 65.

+ Ibid., p. 46.

of the day when the Greeks defended it against the Goths of Vitiges, with the sacrifice of its crowd of statues hurled down for their destruction.

In the crowd speckled by ecclesiastical and peasant costumes, many an English figure, both home and colonial, steadily made way, and many an American one, and a few of the swarthy South Americans. At least one Scotch bonnet and plaid pushed through the throng.¹ And he who wore them saw the well-known cap of the German student. Though, in general, not much addicted to attend the solemnities, the Roman shop-keeper would on this occasion be well represented. His motto had hardly been 'Bread and Shows,' but rather 'Shows and Bread.' The city had, to a considerable extent, lived upon its exhibitions; and every grand one designed by the priests raised them in the eyes of shopkeepers, lodging-keepers, and cabmen. Though, for himself, the Roman, as a rule, could jest at the spectacles, and still more at the contrivers of them, he liked the bread, and he well knew that as things were the spectacles were the readiest way to bring it. That was the soul which inhabited the temple of many a stately Roman body. Nevertheless, there was a latent consciousness within those men, that both place and people were worthy of a nobler use. And sometimes they denounced Antonelli, in language neither civil nor ecclesiastical, for his methods of filching fortunes for himself and his brothers out of the city bread.²

The grand Piazza of St. Peter's would have been at its grandest that day had the sky been true to the Papacy. Nothing but the heavens failed. From every opening into the Piazza flowed the eager crowds. They passed the two hundred and eighty columns, natives sheltering under their umbrellas, strangers compelled by admiration to look up. They passed the Obelisk, those who had history in their

¹ Dr. Philip, author of *The Ghetto and Rome's Great Show*.

² See Liverani at full.

memory, thinking of Nero and of the scenes by him enacted. They passed the Inquisition, perhaps wondering what priests were imprisoned now, and if there were any bishops, and whom; perhaps thinking how strange it was that side by side should stand the memorials of Nero and the chambers of the Inquisition. Then up the steps and across the Portico. At the same time, the coaches of the great swept to the right into the Vatican. About three hundred of these were splendidly horsed, gilt round the top, gilt at all available points, hung high on springs, with four or five servants, in yellow and blue, red and green, embroidered, powdered, and in cocked hats. The few pensive monuments of retrospective royalty that still clave to the skirt of the Pontiff, formed the first line of this array. Then came the thrice-splendid princes of the Church. Each rode in his state carriage, followed, says Frond (vol. vii., p. 91), by a second carriage 'less sumptuous,' and if a prince—we presume by birth—followed by a third. Then came the nuncios, ambassadors, bishops, and notabilities with starry breasts, and ribbons like streamers among the stars—stars that dazzle Romans far more than all the constellations in the sky. The Roman nobles, always splendid, were that day in their fulness of gold, and pearls, and costly array; and their equipages are said to have counted several hundreds. No less than five hundred private ones and some two thousand street carriages completed the train. Roman ecclesiastics could not help remarking, even in print, that from a one-horse hackney coach might be seen alighting a couple of bishops, and four from a two-horse one; a sight which they contrasted with the princely splendour of Constance and of Trent. At the bridge of St. Angelo, and at other important points, rose up in the rain the mounted figures of the Papal dragoons in their long white cloaks. A plentiful display of soldiers, said to amount to about six thousand, increased the variety. Black-clad Barnabite, and brown Franciscan, broad-hatted Jesuit and white Camaldo-

lese, with all the costumes of the barrack, the convent, the nunnery, mingled with those of the drawing-room and the village festival, spangled the thickening crowd.

The clergy of the city had early assembled in sufficient number to line the whole course of the procession, until it reached the statue of St. Peter. Within, the crowd is not represented by any writer as having been excessive. Some say that the church was full, some that it was not quite so. The people arrived in wet clothing, and as none of them, least of all the monks, were given to excessive ablutions, even the correspondent of the *Stimmen aus Maria Laach* alluded to the quality of the air. So also did the Special Correspondent of the *Times*; but he remarked that 'incense covers a multitude of perfumes.' In the various side chapels, Masses were being celebrated, each priest, as he came up to the altar, or retired from it, being preceded by two soldiers under arms, and followed by one. There were upon duty in that temple of peace, opened for a great council of peace, one battalion of zouaves and one of the line.

The soldiers of Diocletian and Galerius, when beginning their work one February morning, while the two Emperors watched them from their palace windows in Nicomedia, would not have been so much at a loss had they entered a temple like St. Peter's, as they found themselves in the Christian church into which they then broke. 'They searched in vain,' says Gibbon, 'for some visible object of worship. They were obliged to content themselves with committing to the flames the volumes of the Holy Scriptures.' They could have found no Bible in St. Peter's to burn, unless they had taken to a sumptuous book, in a dead language, containing portions of the Gospels. But they would not have searched in vain for visible objects of worship. Just as even Father Abraham had been turned into chief idol in the Caaba by the heathen Arabs, so here the chief of the images set up was Peter. But never had he been so dressed in Galilee or Jerusalem, in

Antioch or Babylon, with alb, girdle, stole, and tiara. The Popes might have ill copied the living Peter, but the bronze Peter had well copied the Popes. The Fisherman would have been surprised at his own pluvial. As clerical writers would blush not to tell, it was of red silk, striped with gold. On his breast was a golden cross; on his right hand a golden ring, with a large ruby, and a circle of 'flashing brilliants,' and the left hand held a golden key all decked with precious stones. Before him burned a lamp, and four superb wax candles painted like the illuminations of books. As all men honour their gods with what they value most, the Vatican honours Peter by feeding the jeweller and laceman in his soul with marrow and fatness, and by the sight of men kissing his feet. Peter had his faults, but he never deserved to be so paganised. True, he did forget himself when he got into the palace of the Jewish priest, but not in the same way as the bishop on the Tiber forgot himself when he got into the palace of the Roman Pontiff. That, however, was Peter before he was converted. Peter, after he was converted, passed the threshold of a Roman. Then, he strengthened his brethren, not by lording it either over their persons or their faith, but by teaching a lesson in action, to the effect that no human being should ever degrade his person before a fellow man, and that the forms of worship, as well as the spirit of it, are to be reserved for him whom alone it is lawful for the offspring of God to adore. Peter would not break the commandment that said, 'Be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ' (Matt. xxiii. 8-10).

There in a nutshell lies the whole theory of a direct government as against one by proxy; of a father's government of adult sons, as against a master's government of slaves through upper servants; of one all-watching love, and one all-working

care, as against an imperial reclusion that leaves affairs to departmental divinities. ‘Our Father which art in heaven,’ deeper is Thy love to the least of us, more tender and closer far than could be that of any patron whom we might set up ! In numbering the hairs of our heads, no Vicar dost Thou employ ! In drawing near to Thee, no interest of Thy freedmen do we require, for we are no longer slaves, but in Thy love, the love of a Father, dost Thou invite every one of us to the adoption and therefore to the access of sons !

He, who had once shaken his brethren, did not afterwards strengthen them by telling them that they must all accept him as rabbi, father, and master in the absence of their Lord, while to him there was but one Master, Christ. Just as Peter was ready, in his own person, to keep the commandment ‘Be not ye called masters,’ so would he have been the very first to uphold the corresponding commandment, ‘Call no man master.’ He well knew that this applied pointedly and particularly to the ministers and disciples of the religion of Christ as such ; for he was one of the first to teach both due reverence and due obedience to that civil authority which the Popes live to make little more than a sword under their own power.

The Italian Protestant and the Rabbi would both watch the thousands performing the adoration of St. Peter. The Italian Protestant would think of rites to Romulus, or perhaps to Hercules, whose local story was still more mythical. The Rabbi would think with scorn of the impossibility of such a spectacle in a synagogue over a dressed-up image of Aaron, for the Jews had never reformed the decalogue. He would mentally quote Jeremiah : ‘The stock is a doctrine of vanities. Silver spread into plates is brought from Tarshish, and gold from Uphaz, the work of the workman, and of the hands of the founder; blue and purple is their clothing, they are all the work of cunning men.’¹ Educated Hindus are now often to be seen in Rome. Any of them who witnessed this scene, and heard

¹ Chap. x. 8, 9.

priests complacently point out the distinctions by which simple Westerns are lulled into the notion that this is theoretically a different kind of worship from that paid to lesser gods and to images by Brahmans, would take the distinctions in his supple fingers and snap them as easily as he would so many threads of the finest Dacca looms. The Pundits were in this, as in many things, elder and abler brethren of the priests.

Friedrich, in his Doctor's robes, formed one of the promiscuous crowd ; for mere theologians in Rome did not pass for much. No one has told us where Quirinus stood, or what was his toilet. It is not even clear whether his spirit was vested in a German or an English frame, although probabilities are in favour of the latter. Vitelleschi was there too, with his Roman familiarity with men, forms, and projects. And there was Lord Acton, the Roman Marchese, brother to a bishop, soon to be a Cardinal ; the English Baron nephew to a Cardinal. M. Frond would be in exceedingly great glory. M. Veuillot, frightened, *he says*, by the rain, was in his rooms by the Piazza di Spagna, describing to the *Univers* what he calls 'the moral of the ceremony,'—a fact which he states long afterwards (i., p. 73). He acknowledges that he did not smell the odour of the crowd ; but not on that account is he to be told that he did not see the first session. He went to the top of the Pincio about noon, saw the dome and the Vatican wrapped in fog and rain, and the sky laden as if with storms for all time. But he saw the Council as one ought to see it, and as history will see it ; and never on the sunniest morning did the hill of Peter, the mountain where God dwells, appear more luminous to him.

Correspondents of the *Civiltà* published on the spot, of the *Stimmen* published on the Rhine, of distant journals in America and the East, were revelling in the Catholicity and brilliancy of the spectacle, and preparing to transmit across the Alps and across the seas some vibration of the transports by which every now and then they were themselves thrilled. The un-

tonsured but inevitable correspondents of the profane press were there, odious in forms unknown.

Liberal Catholics from different countries were there in numbers, striving to hope against hope, now thinking of the courage of their national bishops, now of the moderation of the Pontiff; and now exercising faith in the good stars of the Church, but trusting that, somehow or other, credit to the Catholic cause would result from the Council, instead of Jesuit fighting, followed by disaster, which they had too much ground to fear.

On the other hand, the Jesuits were quietly exulting in the knowledge that the days of the Liberal Catholics were numbered. ‘Weighed and found wanting’ were words often upon their lips at that time.

The feeling of the Protestants, of all classes, was chiefly that of curiosity. Such of them as believed that Rome yet retained enough of the Christian element to be capable of reform wished that the Jesuits might fail. Those, on the other hand, who believed that at Trent Rome had written upon herself the doom *irreformable*, thought that the only thing now before her was to go down deeper into her own errors, and to make herself formally what she long had been virtually, the religion simply of the *fait accompli*, a system in which each error once committed must enter into the blood, and even form abnormal bone. Perhaps the words ‘judicial blindness’ were never so often quietly uttered by charitable men as then, and during the months ensuing.

The tomb of Peter shared with his statue in the honours of the morn. In the ray of its lamps knelt many a figure of ‘fair women and brave men.’ The men hoped to rise braver for the coming struggle. The words of the Pontiff were vividly in the memories of the devout—words uttered to five hundred bishops. ‘We never doubted that a mysterious force and salutary virtue emanated from the tomb where repose the ashes of Peter, as a perpetual object of religious veneration to

the world ; a force which inspires the pastors of the Lord's flock with bold enterprises, noble spirit, and magnanimous sentiment.¹ Pius IX. would hardly have seen the force of an inquiry, should any one have dared to make it, whether there was any known case in which one of the Apostles had in Jerusalem sent even the most ignorant of Christians to the tomb of the proto-martyr, ay, or to the tomb of tombs, in order there to seek some blessing that could not be found by going into his own closet, and praying to his Father who seeth in secret.

The *Civiltá*, however, gave a more intelligent turn to this Papal suggestion :—

'It is to be hoped,' it said, 'that this Council, announced on the centenary of St. Peter, convoked by a Bull dated on the day of St. Peter, and assembled round the wonderful tomb of St. Peter, will be *par excellence* the Council of St. Peter. That means the most obsequious to the prerogatives of Peter, whose divine authority, the centre and foundation of all social authority, is at the same time that which is most combated by the spirit of the world, according to the words of the Saviour, "The whole world lieth in wickedness" (1 John v. 19).'

While the people waited, the bishops were robing in the Julian corridor, and the patriarchs in one of the adjoining apartments. Over the grand portico of St. Peter's is a hall, well known on Holy Thursday as the place where the twelve apostles celebrate the Supper—the hall in which the five hundred presented their salutation in 1867. This had been converted into a chapel, by the erection of an altar. Here assembled the members of the procession. Each prelate, on completing his costume, made for the hall, but was not permitted to have any attendant. It being the Day of the Immaculate Conception, the colour of the vestments was white ; a rule, however, which did not bind the Orientals. The cardinals were robing in a room apart. Each of them having done so, entered the hall followed by his train-bearer. As the bishops and prelates waited while the cardinals robed, and the audience

¹ *Allocution* of June 26th, 1867.

waited while the prelates robed, so bishops, prelates, and cardinals waited while the Pope robed. This he did in the Pauline Chapel, attended by three cardinals, two bishops, the sub-deacon apostolic, two protonotaries, and a few minor officials. They adorned him with amice and with alb, with girdle and with stole. Then did the cardinal-priest in waiting bring the censer, and the Pope put the incense on. Then did they further array him in the 'formal,' the pluvial, and the precious mitre. At about half-past nine o'clock, Pius IX., in all the glory of gems and garments, entered the hall, where between seven and eight hundred bishops stood before the altar, awaiting their royal head. He did not wear either the tiara or the usual golden mitre, but a special *precious mitre* made for the occasion. 'This,' says Vitelleschi (p. 3), 'was to indicate a certain equality with the other bishops, which, however, is confined to these little accessories of the ceremonial.' The white pluvial was fastened on his breast by an enamelled clasp, about which clerical writers are particular. The clasp was set with jewels in the form of a dove, with outstretched wings, surrounded by a halo of rays, and *representing the Holy Ghost*. The Pope passed among the Fathers holding out his fingers, in the usual manner, on this side and on that, giving them what is grotesquely called the *pontifical* benediction. Then kneeling at the faldstool he took off his mitre and prayed. Two cardinals, approaching the kneeling Pontiff, placed a book before his eyes. He looked upon it, lifted up his aged but resounding voice, and sang—

‘Creator Spirit, come! ’

This strain was taken up by the choir, and the first verse was sung, all kneeling. The Pontiff then rose, put on his mitre, and was seated in his portative throne.

The portative throne is a contrivance for exhibiting a dignitary to the gaze of a multitude, which does not remind one of anything to be seen elsewhere in Europe, but does

strongly remind one of the way in which a great Guru is carried in India. It is a gorgeous litter, on which is placed a gorgeous chair, under a gorgeous canopy, called a Baldachino. In the chair is seated the Pontiff. Men robed in crimson bear the litter; others bear the canopy on long gilded decorated poles, and beside it others bear gigantic fans of peacocks' feathers.

Even in a secular procession, more serious than an election triumph, this sort of chairing would be of doubtful taste; but in a religious act, above all an act done in the house of God, it would be impossible, except where the æsthetic of faith had expired, and the æsthetic of thought had long surrendered to the æsthetic of sensation. As the Pontiff was set on high, a shot fired from St. Angelo told the waiting multitude that the procession was formed.

We have said that the clergy of the city lined the whole course of the procession on either side. This extended from the door of the hall, through some of the apartments of the Vatican, down the celebrated Royal Staircase, through the magnificent portico of St. Peter's, up the nave to the statue of the Apostle, then to the altar at his grave, and finally, to the right of that altar, into the hall of the Council. As the head of the procession emerged from the hall, the manifold costumes of the clergy formed the skirting of the lofty walls, in the apartments through which it slowly swept. The most noticeable of these was the Royal Hall, *Sala Regia*, where frescoes, suggestive of more swords than one, appealed, by Papal memories, to Papal hopes. There was Gregory VII. giving absolution to the penitent emperor Henry IV. There was the attack upon Tunis in 1553, there the massacre of St. Bartholomew's, the League against the Turks, and Barbarossa receiving the benediction of the Pope in the Piazza of St. Mark. From the Royal Hall descends the Royal Staircase *Scala Regia*, worthy of the king of a larger kingdom than even prosperous Popes have ever held. All down its two flights the

reverent clergy lined the way, as the 'Church Princes' swept by. In the lower flight the Ionic capitals of the colonnade gracefully lengthened out the perspective, while the stately march of mitres glanced between the shafts. With a supreme sense of the importance of the act did the train pass down the noble stair; each prelate no less sustaining the dignity of the moment because just then the eye of the outer world beheld them not. In the view of a real Vaticanist a great procession is a good in itself, and a very high good, apart from its uses; or, perhaps more properly, it is felt that its effectiveness for use wholly depends upon the sense of discipline in its members.

Finally the foot of the stair was reached. The portative throne passed the statue of Constantine, the first who ever drew sword for the Church. It swept round and faced the statue of Charlemagne, the first upon whose head the Church ever set imperial crown. Each stood at an end of the magnificent vista formed by the portico,—grand watchers at the door of the Pontiff, ever telling that the kings whom his Church wants are not merely nursing fathers but champions in fight. As the sight of their uplifted monarch burst upon the people, and that of the people upon their king, the heavy guns from the Aventine were firing alternately with those of St. Angelo, while all the bells were trying to exceed the joypeal of the preceding day. Before his Holiness reached this point, the procession had already entered the nave in slow and gorgeous order.

In front came chamberlains, chaplains, and officials of sixteen ascending grades. After these came the Fathers of the Council,—first the generals of orders, next mitred abbots, and then followed bishops, archbishops, primates, and patriarchs, in succession of still ascending rank, every man in appropriate splendour. The Orientals outshone their western brethren even more than usual; for the robes of the Latins, being confined to the white of the day, were at a disadvantage beside the eastern coats of many colours. The Senator, as

the incumbent is called of a quaint old office under the Papal government, which we might call that of honorary mayor of Rome, marched between the prelates and the throne in golden robe of rich variety. He was accompanied by the conservators, whom we might call something like honorary councilmen, and also by the commandants of the three orders of guards—the noble, the Palatine, and the Swiss. Finally, sitting aloft, with the fans and the bearers, and the poles and the canopy, came the Pontiff. The moving throne was followed by a lengthened rear procession, formed of sundry officials, and closing with the priests, who had for some time been practising shorthand, in order to act as reporters.

The faithful from east and west gazed with enraptured eyes. Many were proud to recognise their own bishops; some still prouder to see their own gifts in robe or gem shining among the adornments of the day. Any Hindu present, looking at priest and soldier, might have exclaimed in the words of the *Bhagavad Gita*: ‘Many a wondrous sight, many a heavenly ornament, many an up-raised weapon; adorned with celestial robes and chaplets; anointed with heavenly essence, covered with every marvellous thing.’¹

From early morn, ‘*the holiest*,’ to use the term of one of the priestly descriptions, had been exhibited upon the altar; but out of tenderness to the throng had been veiled till the procession approached. As it entered the temple, every member of it uncovered to ‘*the holiest*.’ Those who were not members of the Council, after reaching the high altar, defiled to the left. The Fathers of the Council approaching the altar, each in his turn bent the knee before the Host; and then turning to the right, beheld the front of the Council Hall erected between two of the piers which sustain the great dome of Michael Angelo. Over the door was a picture, professing to represent the Eternal Father. The door was kept by the military figures of the Knights of Malta and the noble

¹ Wilkins’s translation, Garrett’s triglot edition, Bangalore, p. 53.

guards. Each prelate, in turn, entered the hall, bowed to the cross erected upon the altar, and was shown to the place assigned to him, according to his rank and seniority; for care was taken that the bishops should not group themselves either according to nation or according to opinion. There, standing and bareheaded, they awaited the Holy Father (*Frond*, vii., p. 98).

After the procession had been for some time moving up the nave, a whisper, ‘The cross, the cross,’ passed from lip to lip. The cross was borne immediately in front of the Fathers of the Council. Priest told priest of its choice beauty and immense costliness. Designed in the Gothic of the thirteenth century, and rich with gems, it represented Christ, not in His passion, but crowned, as conquering Lord, in glory. Among the expressions of delight, the proudest was, ‘It is a present to the Pope from the English convert, the Marquis of Bute.’

The Pope did not, on this occasion, as he usually does, pass up the whole of the nave on his portative throne—a process which guide-books describe as representing the Lord of Glory entering Paradise. He now alighted at the entrance of the basilica, and, with deliberate step, and thrice radiant smiles, his head alone mitred while all others were uncovered in presence of the ‘holiest,’ he marched among soldiers, priests, and subjects, a sovereign *in excelsis*. Before him went his hundreds of lieutenants, in attire which would have dazzled ancient Pontifex, Flamen, and Augur. Every one of them was prepared to contend with princes in his cause, to set his name before that of their king, and to claim, in their respective countries, a supreme sway for his sceptre. Not a few of them had endured prosecution or prison to uphold his law against that of their country, and no note of the lyres that sounded the praises of the day was sweeter than that which commemorated the name of any martyr-bishop, hero of the kingdom of God, against the naturalism of the age.

The Cardinals had not followed the bishops into the hall.

They now stood near the high altar. Two bishops were at the faldstool, with book and candle. At the altar itself stood the officiating Cardinal, with a priest, a deacon and subdeacon, a master of the ceremonies, five acolytes bearing candles, and three clerks of the chapel. On arriving at the altar the Pontiff bowed upon the faldstool. Then the last strophe of the *Veni Creator* was exquisitely sung by the choir. To use the words of a priest, written, not for Spaniards or Brazilians, but for Germans: ‘Every member of the historical procession cast himself upon his knees before our God and Saviour in the form of bread, before whom all kings bow.’¹

After the adoration of the Host the Pope, still kneeling, recited aloud the prayer, ‘Look upon us, O. God our protector!’—*Protector Noster Aspice Deus*—and for some time he continued reciting prayers in alternation with the choir. ‘Rising up,’ says Monsignor Guérin, ‘he recited a prayer to the Holy Sacrament, another to the Holy Spirit, a third to invoke the aid of the Holy Virgin, and that of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, a fourth to God’ (*Guérin*, p. 76).

The Cardinals, with their train-bearers, now turning to the right, entered the Hall of the Council, where the bishops had been waiting for some time.

As the Pope advanced to the eventful enclosure, two former comrades in one lawyer’s office held the corners of his pluvial—the Cardinals Antonelli and Mertel. If these ministers deserved half of the ill that was said of them by the common voice of Rome, or even by a writer like Liverani, who shuns private scandal, and only treats of public acts, Pius IX. was not at that moment to be congratulated on the character of his companions. Confiding in the patronage of her whom he had set on high, he once more passed among the ornate hundreds of his mighty but docile servants. Approaching the altar he offered up a prayer; then passing to the throne at the far end of the Hall, he, in the words of Sambin,

¹ *Stimmen, Neue Folge*, vi., p. 116.

'dominated the whole assembly, and appeared like the teaching Christ' (p. 55).

The German Jesuit who wrote for the *Stimmen* said, 'The bloodless offering was being presented on the altar, and soon must the *invisible Head of the Church be present in form of bread*. Opposite sits His representative upon a throne; below him, the Cardinals; around, the Catholic world, represented in its bishops' (*Neue Folge*, vi., p. 162).

This localized presence, not yet actual, but to come at the word of the priest, was the same as that 'divine presence' which Cardinal Manning, when leaving home, said many in the English Church were sighing for as having formerly been in their churches. The early Christians saw the most sublime token of God's presence in that absence of any similitude which perplexed the heathen soldiery at Nicomedia, which, in India, first perplexes and then awes the Hindu, and which to spiritual worshippers says, in the deep tone of silence—

'Lo, God is here, let us adore !'

From the time when the words 'Ye saw no similitude' were inscribed on that temple at Sinai, compared to which St. Peter's is but as the show-room of a decorator compared to it, those words 'Ye saw no similitude' have ever been the celestial light of all temples of Him to whom none is like, none second, and none vice-gerent—temples wherein we walk by faith, not by sight.

At this point, rather more than twenty of the particulars set down in the program had been got through, but there were one hundred and forty-eight of them in all. It would be well worth while for any merely philosophic politician to follow them one by one, marking the directions by which every act, posture, and prayer, whether audible or silent, was prescribed. The science of government by spectacle really deserves study by men of sense, because the practice of it is so mighty with all who take an impression for a reason. The

program is in the *Acta*, and those who choose to read it will find a prescription for each minutest move.

The Archbishop of Iconium, whose real office was that of Vicar of St. Peter's, approached the throne, holding his mitre in his hands; he made a profound obeisance, then drawing near, he kissed the Pope's knee. After this, mounting the pulpit, he preached, in cope and mitre, a sermon unlike that of Father Bianchi. It was long and tame, and hardly had the true Infallibilist ring. He felt that they were entering upon an untried and thorny path. 'Tribulation,' he said, 'will arise, bitter days and innumerable sorrows' (*Acta*, p. 204-214). After the sermon, the Pope rose and gave the benediction, during which the cardinals and bishops stood, the abbots and generals of orders kneeling down. 'It is,' says Monsignor Guérin, 'the Moses of the new law, with his shining brow.' He then offered up a prayer, with invocation of the Church triumphant and of all saints, 'the formidable army which is drawn up around the Pope and the Council, and which assures victory to the Church,' as Guérin expounds it. The preacher then published the indulgences from the pulpit. Now came an interlude preparatory to a transaction of grave importance. To prescribe the action of the interlude, it required all the articles of the program from thirty-seven to fifty. To perform that action took up in a Christian place of worship probably a full half-hour of the time of seven hundred bishops, of several thousand clergymen, of Knights of Malta, of noble guards, Palatine guards, Swiss guards, of some two thousand soldiers, and of probably twenty thousand people. Two bishops, with book and candle, draw near to the throne. The Pontiff recites *Quam dilecta*, etc. The sub-deacon apostolic, who is a judge of the high court of the Rota, called the Supreme Tribunal of the whole Christian world, advances. He is accompanied by two judges of the high court of the Signet, to which even the Rota, in spite of its title, is subordinate.¹ The three judges

¹ *Fronde*, iii., p. 10.

solemnly bear to the throne in a scarf of silver cloth the apostolic stockings and slippers trimmed with gold lace. The Pontiff puts on stockings and slippers. Monsignor the Sacristan takes his place at the altar ready to give out the robes. The two judges of the high court of the Signet stand at the altar ready to take the robes from Monsignor the Sacristan, and to hand them to the cardinal deacon. Then the cardinal deacon approaches the throne. The senior cardinal priest ascends the steps of the throne and takes the ring from off the Pontiff. The judges of the high court of the Signet bring the robes to the throne. Then the senior cardinal priest, assisted by the cardinal deacons, takes off from the Pontiff the mitre, takes off the formal, the pluvial, the stole and the girdle; after which he puts on the cord, the pectoral cross, the fanon, the stole, the tunic, the dalmatic, the gloves, and the white chasuble wrought with gold. The sub-deacon apostolic now bears the pallium to the throne, and one of the judges of the high court of the Signet accompanies him, bearing the pins. The cardinal deacon then puts upon the Pontiff the sacred pallium, but whether it was he or the sub-deacon apostolic who fastened it to the fanon with three pins set with precious stones, is a matter not determined in the *Acta*, and somewhat thrown into doubt by a slight confusion in the statement of Canon Pelletier, who writes the seventh volume of *Frond*. Now the cardinal deacon takes the mitre and replaces it on the Pontiff. Finally, the senior cardinal priest again ascends the steps of the throne and puts on the ring which he had before taken off. And seven hundred bishops, and several thousand priests, and a couple of thousand soldiers, and some twenty thousand people, all were agreed that this was imposing, impressive, divine.

This public toilet was in preparation for what Cecconi calls 'the sublime and moving rite called the Obedience,' the homage of the vassals to the ruler of the world. First the Cardinals one by one arose, slowly approached the throne,

performed an obeisance, and kissed the hand of the sovereign. Then patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, approaching in their turn, made low reverences before the steps of the throne, and, slowly drawing nigh, kissed the Pope's right knee. Abbots and generals of orders knelt before reaching the steps of the throne, rose, drew nigh, knelt again, and kissed the king's right foot. For an hour and a quarter this act of homage was continued. From the banks of the Thames and of the Seine, of the Ganges and the Hudson ; from the Alps and the Andes ; from historic lands of Asia, whence the light of history had long faded ; from emerging countries in the New World, on which its first beams were beginning to strike,—came forward lordly figures of men accustomed to command, and sometimes to domineer. Each, with chosen and awe-struck movement, drew near to the king of his heart and conscience, and rendered up his homage, like gold and frankincense and myrrh.

Vitelleschi, in a vein genuinely Roman, alluding to these 'five quarters of an hour' spent in bowing, kneeling, and kissing, says, 'What strength of memory is necessary for him who being humbly entitled the Servant of the Servants of God, had to keep that modest formula in mind during the whole ceremony.' But if the scene at this particular point might tax the memory of the Pope, it would surely cheer the hopes of those 'august minds' that, having adapted their code to the views of confessors, were now idle spectators of the Council, while other kings were on their thrones. The ex-sovereigns of Naples, Tuscany, and Parma, looking on that display of widely-extended power, and viewing through the stained windows of a Catholic imagination the political forces represented by it, might be both excused and commiserated if they saw signs of happy days returning. But the ambassador of a reigning king might ask himself, Is it likely that those knee-kissing and foot-kissing magnates will be loyal to my master any longer than he is loyal to theirs ? I-

a prince relying on such support, like one in a portative throne, higher up than is comely, while his bearers are steady and the crowd is pleased, but liable to be found down among the feet of the people if the bearers wince or the crowd makes a rush?

The Jesuits said, 'Surely those non-Catholics who witnessed this action must have perceived that Catholicity, like unity, is found only where Christ lives, speaks, and reigns—in Peter; that is, in the Roman Church, of which Pius IX. is now Peter.' But we may quietly ask, Could even those writers fancy Peter, at the only Apostolic Council, seated upon a throne somewhere on Mount Zion, while John, James, and Paul came up in the presence of the assembled Church and kissed his knee, and Philip, Barnabas, and others knelt and kissed his foot? Far as the æsthetics of those Jesuits had descended, by a long materialising process, they must surely have read enough of the Holy Scriptures to feel that the scene enacted in St. Peter's, though a fine edition of a Durbar, was a sad fall from an Apostolic Council. You promise the pupils of Plato a higher wisdom than they ever knew in the Academy, and they find for wisdom the gewgaws of Freemasons. Such a scene was bad in manners, bad in politics, and bad in religion. In manners, it tended to make men servile in a lower position and arrogant in a higher; in politics, it tended to make them either slaves or despots; in religion, it tended to make them either unbelieving or superstitious. Is it part of the penalty of Rome that barbaric forms should linger at its Court, when the spirit of Christianity has banished them from the Courts of Christian kings? Our own monarch, at the head of her two hundred and eighty millions, is too good a Christian to make her subject Rajahs, as a spectacle for her commons and her troops, come and fall down and kiss her foot. The words which commanded the followers of Christ not to exercise over one another the kind of lordship which the kings of the Gentiles exercised over them were, with pompous action,

publicly trampled upon in this scene of ‘the obedience,’ and that both in the spirit and in the letter. He who complacently sat and acted out that scene in the house of God for an hour and a quarter, might better claim to represent many known in the history of ambition, than the lowly Lord of Peter.

Up to this time only sixty-seven articles of the program had been performed. Thirty more were exhausted by postures, manipulations, and devotions. The officiating cardinal-priest then came forward, bearing the reeking censer. He waved it before the enthroned priest, around whom swelled up the clouds till subject eyes looked up to him through a sacred haze, and till he looked down on his subject creatures from a sky of fragrant mist. This ceremony fulfilled, all took their seats with their mitres on, and the Pontiff, rising, delivered his allocution. It overflowed with joy and hope. It clearly pointed out the enemy to be destroyed. ‘A conspiracy of the wicked, mighty by combination, rich in resources, fortified with institutions, and using liberty for a cloak of maliciousness.’ Obviously this enemy was not a theological but a political one. Vitelleschi, who naturally heard with Italian ears, says that the language, though *using a cloak*, was plain enough to show what enemy was meant.

As the Pontiff drew to the close of his allocution, he, with a burst of feeling, put up two invocations, one to the Holy Spirit, the other to the Blessed Virgin. After this, with contagious intensity of emotion, he threw up both hands to heaven. At a bound, the whole assembly stood up. Then he poured forth the final invocation with the fullest resonance of his wonderful tones,—tones which might have served in chanting from Gerizim to Ebal. He invoked angels and archangels, Peter, Paul, and all the saints, more particularly those whose ashes were venerated on that spot. This speech from the apostolic throne, exclaims Monsignor Guérin, beginning with the liveliest joy, afterwards expressing divine agonies, concluded with firm and tranquil confidence!

Now followed another round of ceremonies, at the close of which the master of the ceremonies proclaimed, 'Let those who are not members of the Council withdraw.' The royal and noble spectators left the scene; the doors were closed. The Knights of Malta and the noble guard stood sentry between the faithful, who were to receive the creed as it might be shaped, and the Fathers, who were to decide for them what their creed should be. What would take place before those doors should be opened again? Persistent rumour had said that the extreme party meant to attempt an acclamation. Therefore many believed it possible that in one brief sitting the basis of infallibility might be shifted from that of an infallible Church to that of an infallible man.

Other rumours asserted that some French prelates had let it be known that if any attempt at getting up an acclamation should be made, they would leave the Council. But what might take place behind those charmed walls, who could tell? All that could be said with certainty was that now, for the first time in the history of man, one hundred and seventy millions, perhaps two hundred millions, were standing idle spectators of the process of altering their creed. They had not a single representative; not one channel of expression, not one possible resort in appeal. What used to be a general council was now a conclave; sitting behind a guard of armed men. King and priest, councillor of state and doctor of divinity, were equally shut out. The Catholic multitude appeared indifferent. The few who were not indifferent were powerless. They had all been parties to narrowing the idea of the Church to that of the clergy. That idea was now, without the consent of any one being asked, formally narrowed from that of the clergy to that of the bishops and Court prelates. It might further be narrowed from that of the Episcopate to that of the Pope. It appears to us not very easy to call men fanatics who have done so much with mankind, when they propose and expect to do still more!

The point at which we now stand in the program of the day is the 109th Article, which is the first of several prescribing a ceremony with a substance. Bishop Fessler, Secretary of the Council, and Bishop Valenziani of Fabriano, approached the throne. The Secretary handed a document to the Pontiff. The Pope handed the document to Valenziani, who thereupon, ascending the pulpit, turned towards the throne, made a profound obeisance, took off his mitre, and read out as follows :—‘Pius, the Bishop-Servant of the Servants of God, with the approbation of the Holy Council.’ Having now pronounced the title of the Decree, he again put on his mitre, seated himself, and proceeded to read the substance of the Decree. This consisted of one sentence, declaring the Council opened. In that ill-constructed hall few heard what was read; and many were wicked enough to hint that, if ill-constructed, the hall was not ill-contrived. Once more laying aside the mitre, Bishop Valenziani rose and asked, ‘Is the Decree now read agreed to?’ The bishops were seated in their mitres, the abbots standing bareheaded. There was no formal vote. Those who understood what was said, cried *Placet*, and others repeated the cry. No one dissented. This result was communicated to the sovereign, and he from the throne proclaimed—‘The Decree now read is agreed to by the Fathers, none dissenting; and we decree, enact, and sanction it, as read.’

These forms were exactly repeated, and a second Decree was passed. Like the first, it consisted of a single sentence, which fixed the next public session for the 6th of January. The two Promoters of the Council, as they were called, now advancing, first knelt on the lowest step of the throne, and then addressed the notaries, saying, ‘We pray you, Protonotaries here present, to draw up an authentic document, recording all and singular the acts done in this public session of the all-holy Æcumenical Vatican Council.’ The senior protonotary then appealing to the Majordomo and the High Chamberlain, who stood on

the right hand of the throne, said, 'We shall draw it up, ye being witnesses' (*Frond*, vii., p. 119).

The constitutional crisis had come and gone, and very few were aware of it. Those who had thought of the program as anything more than the order of a pageant, must have observed that the signification of those acts amounted to no less than putting aside the conciliar form of Decree, and adopting in its stead that of the Papal Bulls. We have already seen that Friedrich, as a Church historian, saw this at a glance. It need not be said that the ancient Councils, representing the whole Church, spoke in their own name, themselves *decreeing* and *enacting*. As to the only Council 'over' which Pontiff Peter I. 'presided,' it would not do to cite it as an example.¹ As late as Trent, every Decree bore upon the face of it the words, '*This holy Council enacts and decrees.*' All the statutes of the Council of Trent, without alteration of a word, were immediately confirmed by the Pope, he having beforehand promised, in writing, to do so. The formula then used was, of course, liable to the interpretation that it indicated the superiority of the Council to the Pope. That interpretation had been actually put upon it by schools in the Church, at one time, including whole nations.

The Decrees now passed had never been before the Council for deliberation, but were handed from the throne ready made. The Pope, according to the formula, did not merely sanction, but *decreed, enacted, and sanctioned*,—that is, he took the part of both parliament and crown.

The Council is only mentioned as 'approving' of this absorption of its own powers into those of its head. The part thus allowed to this co-called Ecumenical Council, this Senate of Humanity, in framing Decrees, is less than the part allowed to the College of Cardinals in the framing of Bulls. Take, for instance, the Bull of Convocation. It expressly says that, in

¹ In the list of Popes, the name Peter is repeated only in the case of one, and he was an anti-pope.

issuing it, the Pope acts not only with the consent of the Cardinals, but by their counsel.

This expresses more than 'with the approbation.' All, therefore, that the collective episcopate did for the College of Cardinals was somewhat to curtail its relative legislative importance. Alone, both its counsel and consent were recognised. When united with all the bishops, only its consent. This looked like telling the bishops that their counsel was superfluous. In the Bull history conquered dogma. The counsel and consent of the Cardinals was the memento of the historical fact that the Bishop of Rome originally spoke with authority only when he spoke as the mouthpiece of the local clergy. In the Decree dogma conquered history. The Bishop of Rome alone was to appear as speaking with authority, and all other bishops were to appear only as approving, but neither as counselling nor confirming; as for the clergy, they were no longer of the Teaching Church. The success of the Court manœuvre was facilitated by the fact that the form now adopted had on previous occasions been used in Councils held in the city of Rome, for there the municipal spirit habitually blinded men even to the value of Catholic forms. The substance of the Decrees passed was perfectly innocent. They had, moreover, the advantage of exactly copying the acts done in the first session at Trent, while destroying the forms there employed. In the *Acta* of that Council two resolutions, declaring the Council opened, and fixing the day for the second public session, were entered as constituent acts, before the heading given to Decrees of the constituted body began to be used. The two constituent resolutions were not even headed by the name of the Council, while the name of the Pope does not occur in the heading of any of the Decrees, much less does it stand as the sole legislative authority.

At Trent it was not a private member of the Council, like Bishop Valenziani, but the first presiding legate, Cardinal De Monte, who read out the draft of a resolution, in the form

of a question, declaring the Council opened. To this question the Fathers 'all with one consent answered *Placet*.' The second resolution was put in the same form. Both, as we have intimated, were entered without the heading of Decrees, and stand as the acts of a body organising itself, but not as legislative acts of that body when organised. Every subsequent Decree is a real legislative act, and therefore bears the formal heading, 'The All-Holy Council of Trent, in the Holy Ghost lawfully assembled, . . . ordains and decrees.'¹

The formula adopted in the Vatican Council had the advantage of determining, once for all, what that Council was to be, namely, a secret consistory of bishops, to give an approval to Papal Constitutions. Its Presidents were Cardinals, an office unknown to the Christian Church,—princes simply of the Court of Rome, though most of them bear the orders of priest. Of the members of the Council a vast number, though called bishops, were really no more than mitred equerries and chamberlains. In the means it took to deprive the diocesan bishops of their inherited powers in Council, the Curia knew its men. Brought up in the sentiment that an effective 'function' is the sublimest stroke of civil or ecclesiastical government, it would have been a revolt against all their instincts to disturb a pageant so unrivalled as the one in which they that day had the felicity of bearing a part. The Curia placed them in this dilemma: Either they must rise up amidst that blaze of splendour and resist the act of the sovereign at whose feet they had just bowed, or they must learn at a later stage, if they should then challenge the Rules of Procedure, that the moment for objection was past. The success of the Curia was complete. The general drew out his men for a review, and turned the Thermopylæ of the opposition without having ever

¹ The form of the opening resolutions and of the Decrees is found in any edition of the Canons and Decrees of the Council; the full account of the proceedings, taken down at the time by Massarellus, the Secretary of the Council, in Theiner's *Acta Genuina*, vol. i., 28, 29.

seen a Spartan. Those who had come up resolved to oppose changes in their creed soon found that the one pass that might have been held against overwhelming odds was already in the enemy's rear. The Nine had not spent nearly ten months on the Rules of Procedure for nothing.

When this brief episode in the drama of the day had passed over, the doors were thrown open, and the spectators who had been excluded resumed their places. Many of the priests outside would feel disappointed that they had not heard the hall resound with the voices of an acclamation. That would have told that Papal infallibility was adopted without discussion. Friedrich lets it appear that he felt relieved at the opening of the doors before there had been any exulting sound, and doubtless many shared his feeling.

Rumours, persistently kept up, declared that Archbishop Manning would propose the dogma, and that the majority, breaking out into acclamation, would bear down all opposition. If such a design was ever entertained, it had been thought—some say it had been found—that it would prove wiser not to proceed so hastily. The passing of two Decrees in the form of Papal Constitutions was enough to carry ‘the forms of the house,’ while the issuing of the Rules of Procedure as a Bull, before the Council was opened, had taken away every pretext for alleging that they were open to revision by the Council itself, as being its own acts.

Archbishop Manning, on his return to England, in a pastoral, treated the rumour of an intended acclamation as if it was only laughable. A reason which he assigns for this is that Rome had had enough of acclamations, seeing that many who acclaimed infallibility in 1867 had openly turned against it. The rumours, however, were too consistent, and too well supported by the hints of the *Civiltà* and by the plain words of Monsignor Plantier and others, to be prudently dismissed with a smile—at least, anywhere but in England. They were not what Dr. Manning represents them, rumours of an acclamation

without a definition, but of a definition carried by acclamation, as in the case of the Immaculate Conception. On the other hand, Archbishop Manning's thrust at those who had in 1867 signed language that might seem to mean everything included in infallibility, without themselves intending to express that doctrine, is natural in one who had not wholly unlearned the Protestant worth of words. Nevertheless, of all grounds on which the prefects of the Pope should begin to trip one another up, the ground to be selected by preference is scarcely that of finesse in the interpretations they put on what they say. As to the part assigned to Dr. Manning personally, it is possible that the rumour represented no more than the fact that both they who hoped for an acclamation, and they who feared it, mentioned the name which occurred to them as that of the most likely instrument of such a procedure, and both happened to pronounce the same name. As if to justify this instinctive selection of both parties, Dr. Manning, on his return home, said that if the Council 'had defined the infallibility at its outset, it would not have been an hour too soon; and perhaps it would have averted many a scandal we now deplore.'¹

A Roman noble thus notes the zeal of Dr. Manning :—

'No one is so devoted as a convert. Having himself erred for half his lifetime did not restrain him from becoming the most ardent champion of infallibility. This circumstance raised a presumption of a deficiency, on his part, in that traditional ecclesiastical spirit which is never fully acquired but by being early grounded and by long continued usage,—a presumption which was justified by his excessive and intemperate restlessness. This seemed a cause sufficient to lessen his authority with the Conservative portion of the ecclesiastical world, which judges with more calmness and serenity.'²—(Vitelleschi, p. 35.)

The real work of the day was now done. It was time to sing the *Te Deum*. The Pontiff sounded the first note, and was followed by the Fathers of the Council, by the choir, by

¹ *Priv. Petri*, Part III., p. 36.

² This version, made before the publication of the English translation, differs from it only in immaterial points. (See *Eight Months*, p. 22.)

the thousands outside in the Basilica. The strain was caught up in nave and aisles, in every chapel and every gallery ; it mounted aloft into vaults and dome, till all who were beneath the gorgeous roof thrilled under that returning swell of exulting sound ; and many felt as if the world was falling, overwhelmed with harmony, at the feet of Pio Nono. But the shepherd on Mount Soracte heard only the bleating of his sheep, and the Italian sentinels at Spoleto, to the north, and at Gaeta, to the south, each heard but his own footfall, timed as regularly as it had been timed the day before.

The eighteen articles of the program still remaining, contained little beyond unrobing, re-robing, and dissolving.

The people had been for seven hours in the Cathedral. It still rained in torrents. This not only damped their spirits, but spoiled the illuminations. The clerical organs said the providential rain had prevented mobs in different places from making hostile demonstrations. During the time spent in the Cathedral, the people had not heard—except so far as some of them could make out the Latin—a sentence of the Word of God or of the words of man. The seven hours of the twenty thousand had been spent in an intermitting gaze. All went away, not only praising the pageant of the day, but extolling it. Friedrich quotes a diplomatist who said it was ‘superb.’ The correspondent of the *Times* said : ‘It has been my fortune to see many pageants in Rome, but none of them equalled, in majestic solemnity, the scene presented by the procession of bishops from all countries in the world.’¹ Monsignor Guérin cried : ‘It offered the most majestic and enchanting spectacle which it was ever given to mortals to behold here below.’ M. Veuillot said that bishops were there from the rising to the setting of the sun,—men who would invade regions as yet closed against them,—the light-bearers and the God-bearers.² These old men, he added, would over-

¹ *Times*, Dec. 14th, 1869.

² ‘*Les portes-lumières et les portes-Dieu.*’

throw darkness and death, and the day would break (vol. i., p. 12). Vitelleschi remarked that there was indeed a bishop from Chaldea and one from Chicago, but the former did not represent a Catholic Chaldea, nor the latter a Catholic Chicago. Even, he added, in countries called Catholic, what proportion of the population are really of their flocks? He might have further added, And if their teaching is true, what proportion of their flocks are really Catholics?—for they teach that a doubt on any single article of faith propounded by their Church, or a doubt on one of her interpretations of a text of Scripture, taints one with heresy. How many Italians were, on the day of the opening of the Council, free from that taint?

We are reminded of an Englishman whose name, when he was only thirty years of age, gained for him distinguished attention at the Vatican. His Protestantism was much influenced by his early study of the corruptions of Christianity at the centre of them. Had John Milton witnessed that pageant we know exactly what he would have said. First, he would have shown that when the filial spirit of Christianity had been lost, the servile spirit of Paganism supervened. When men ceased to come to God as children to a father, they sought circuitous access through upper servants. Then followed what he describes in a sentence with a strong flavour of the *Phædrus*:—

'They began to draw down all the divine intercourse betwixt God and the soul, yea, the very shape of God Himself, into an exterior and bodily form, urgently pretending a necessity and obligement of joining the body in a formal reverence, and worship circumscribed; they hallowed it, they fumed it, they sprinkled it, they bedecked it, not in robes of pure innocency, but of pure linen, with other deformed and fantastic dresses, in palla and mitres, gold and gewgaws fetched from Aaron's old wardrobe, or the flamin's vestry: then was the priest set to con his motions and his postures, his liturgies and his lurries, till the soul, by this means of overbodying herself, given up justly to fleshly delights, bated her wing apace downward: and finding the ease she had from her visible and sensuous colleague the body, in performance of religious duties, her pinions now

broken and flagging, shifted off from herself the labour of high soaring any more, forgot her heavenly flight, and left the dull and droiling carcase to plod on in the old road, and drudging trade of outward conformity. . . . They knew not how to hide their slavish approach to God's behests, by them not understood, nor worthily received, but by cloaking their servile crouching to all religious presentments, sometimes lawful, sometimes idolatrous, under the name of humility, and terming the piebald frippery and ostentation of ceremonies, decency.'—*Of Reformation in England, first book.*

A writer in the *Stimmen* thought that if those who were separated from the Church had only been present they might have been won back. It would be an easy way to settle the merits of a religion, if it could be done by the simple experiment of what body had the grandest building for a display, or the greatest number of richly dressed men to perform. We do not presume to say whether Peter ever did visit Rome or not; but, supposing that he did, the question between him and the sovereign Pontiff of the day, as to the value of their respective religions, would soon have been settled in favour of Nero, if it had gone by buildings, statues, robes, and retinues. Probably the poor itinerant preacher was so conscious that, as Milton would say, his religion 'to the gorgeous solemnities of paganism, and the sense of the world's children, seemed but a homely and yeomanly religion,' that he would not have challenged comparison with the purpled Pontiff on that ground. No more would he have done so than would our Lord Chancellor attempt to prove that he was as much a lord as the Lord Mayor, because he had as fine a coach and as classic a Gog and Magog. An intelligent Moslem would hardly expect a Brahman to stake the claims of his religion on a comparison between the Taj Mahal and the pagodas at Benares. Any writer who could imagine that the tendency of a 'function' performed in the manner of the one we have described is to convince Protestants that the Church of Rome has in her forms much likeness left to the Church of Christ, must be unaware of the first elements of a comparison. When

we search the Scriptures daily to see whether these things are so, the estrangement of the Papacy from the Christianity of Christ, and its affinity to the Romanism of the Pagan Pontiffs, become more and more impressive.

In contemplating these opening ceremonies we naturally think of those at Nicaea. In the Vatican we have a Christian bishop who is at the same time an amateur emperor. In Nicaea we have a real emperor and the son of an emperor, a conqueror and the son of a conqueror. This emperor had become an amateur bishop—a general bishop, as Eusebius styles him (*Koinos Episcopos*). Did he enter the solemn assembly borne on human shoulders, and with a cohort of guards? A few persons went before him, ‘not any of the usual protectors or guards, but those only of his friends who profest the faith of Christ. And when upon a sign which declared the emperor’s entrance, they had all risen up, at length he himself came, walking in the midst, like some celestial angel of God.’

Eusebius does not find a single word for the vestments of all the bishops! The men themselves he had called a garland, but for aught he had to say, their dress might have been good or bad, canonical or of work-day fashion. The only toilet worthy of a remark was that of the emperor, ‘shining with his bright purple garment as it were with the splendour of light, glistening with flaming rays, and adorned with the clear brightness of gold and precious stones. Such was the attire of his body.’

What then was his moral bearing? Did he make the poor men before him kneel at his feet and kiss them?

‘As to his mind, it was sufficiently manifest that it was, to an accuracy, adorned with the fear and reverence of God. And an indication hereof was given by his cast-down eyes, his flushing countenance, and his gate and motion. . . . When a low chair, made of gold, had been placed before him, he sate not down till such time as the bishops had beckoned to him.’¹

This last trait is often cited by Vatican writers, we are sorry to say, even in standard books of instruction, as proving,

¹ *Life of Const.*, lib. iii., cap. x.

not the courtesy of the emperor, but the superior rank of the clergy. In which of these two aspects was it regarded by Eusebius? ‘Like some general bishop constituted by God, he convened God’s ministers, nor disdained to be present, and sat with them in the midst of their congress. . . . And sat in the midst of them as one among many.’¹ Those bishops, instead of assuming their own superiority in rank to crowned heads, as Romish doctors instil into their pupils that they ought to do, respectfully rose at the approach of the emperor; but they did not cast themselves on their knees as if a god had come in. On the other hand, the monarch, instead of exacting servile homage, showed delicate respect, like a civilised man with some idea of Christianity. The impression really made by the pomps in St. Peter’s on any Italian Protestants who beheld them would be accurately represented by Ochino, a general of the Capuchins, whose eloquence once filled Rome and all the chief cities of Italy with wonder, and whose work on the origin of the Papacy, written on the banks of the Thames, is one of the curiosities of the British Museum. He preceded Milton in dramatising the counsels of Satan, whom he makes to say to his fallen powers:—

‘But after longe consultinge and devising there is now come in to my head a very handsome imaginacion, whereby we may destroy the kingdome of Christ and establish our kingdome for ever. . . . I have conceaved in my head a deceyt of suche weight and importaunce, that if I may bring it aboute after suche sorte as I have devised it, there was never man sawe, nether yet in the worlde was there ever anye that devysed the lyke both for the straigenes and for the force thereof. . . (He accordingly calls the Pope,) Hym who among all the wicked hath the highest place, and is moste adversary to Christ, and therefore is he and may wourthely be called Antichrist.’²

¹ Lib. i., cap. xliv. The English expression, *one among many*, might signify pre-eminent; but the words are *ωνει καὶ τῶν πολλῶν εἰς*, and the Latin rendering of Valesius is, *Unus e multis.*

² A Tragoedie or Dialogue of the unjuste usurped primacie of the Bishop of Rome, and of all the just abolishing of the same, made by Master Bernardine Ochine, an Italian, translated from the Latin by Master John Ponet, Doctor of Divinitie. Anno, 1549.

The feeling in St. Peter's did not permit guards to be dispensed with. It transpired that extreme precaution had been taken to prevent the Basilica from being blown up. At the time, the general impression appeared to be that some of the National party had played upon the fears of the priests, hoaxing them with hints of such a design. But after what occurred in Paris during the reign of the Commune, one can hardly think it impossible that some of the violent and ignorant may have entertained wild plans. In 1867, a startling example of what might be done had been shown in the blowing up of a barrack of the zouaves. When populations which have long been governed by spectacle, set out for a political sensation, they sometimes go dreadful lengths to find a stirring one.

The city was to have been grandly illuminated, but the drenching rain would have mocked all effort to keep in the tender life of the lamps. Let us hope, said the clerical writers, that the blue sky of Rome will smile on the close of the Council, and that then the eternal city will glow brighter even than Ephesus in 431 (*Stimmen*, N. F., p. 166).

In addition to human helps to faith, it was announced that divine helps had been vouchsafed. On this ever-memorable day the bones of the martyrs at Concordia had distilled water, which in that part of Venetia was a recognised presage of a joyful future. This is announced in the organ of that Court which was soberly undertaking to inaugurate a new era for all the societies of men (*Civiltá*, VII., ix., 104).

The same periodical in the very next sentence gave samples of *fanatical* English Protestants. Citing the *Pall Mall Gazette*, it told how a series of meetings had been held in Freemason's Hall, at the suggestion of Dr. Merle D'Aubigné, to pray for the Council. It went on to say that the Chairman, Mr. Arthur Kinnaird, had told how similar meetings for prayer were to be held all over the world, and even among the Protestants of Italy. It quoted two of the petitions said to have been offered up. Canon Auriol prayed that *all the machinations of Rome*

might be turned to confusion, and Dr. Cumming that the day of her imagined triumph might prove to be that of her prophesied ruin.

It was much pleasanter work to tell of the Anti-Council of the Freethinkers at Naples. Praying Protestants are to be hated and extinguished. But vaunting infidels are to the Jesuits what fires are to insurance offices,—their apparent foes, but their only real supports. That assembly spent a couple of days in vague and sometimes vast talk. It abused the Pope, and the Jesuits say it blasphemed God. It proposed to find a code of morals without religion, those flowers without any stems which are the holy grail of such knights errant. Finally, it attacked the French Emperor and the Italian monarchy, and was dissolved by the police. Demonstrations of a somewhat similar kind were attempted in a few other cities of Italy. In France, on the contrary, the following cities were illuminated, and were lauded not only in their local clerical journals, but in the great *Civiltà*: Lyons, Bordeaux, Marseilles, Toulouse, Limoges, Clermont, Saint-Etienne, Laval, Moulins, Nismes, Auch, ‘and others.’ Even in Paris many convents illuminated their façades. (*Guérin*, p. 78.)

At Vienna a meeting of the nobility, gentry, clergy, and officials composing the Catholic Societies, and numbering, it is said, four thousand, was held to celebrate the day. The only Italian city specified as having made any favourable demonstration was Brescia; and the account amounted to no more than that of an attendance of some Society of young men at Mass, and of the sending of a promise of adhesion to the Council.

CHAPTER II.

First Proceedings—Unimportant Committees and All-Important Commissions—No Council if Pope dies—Theologians discover their Disfranchisement—Father Ambrose—Parties and Party Tactics—Were the Bishops Free Legislators?—Plans of Reconstruction—Plan of the German Bishops—Segesser's Plan—New Bull of Excommunications.

THE day following the wonderful Wednesday, of which the proceedings filled up the last chapter, was not too much for rest, and probably, indeed, was too little for the bishops to tell how effective the function had been. On the Friday, however, they had again to meet for the first General Congregation, or deliberative sitting. This was presided over by the Cardinals appointed, whereas the Pope in person presided over the Public Sessions, or solemnities for formally promulgating Decrees. Cardinal De Reissach, Chief President, was not in his chair, but upon his death-bed. As we have seen, he had superintended the drawing up (it is believed that with his own hand he had drawn up) the first code of laws to regulate the relations of the Church to civil society; but his code has never met the public eye.

From this first General Congregation, writes Friedrich, even the theologians were shut out.

The occupation of the day for nearly eight hundred bishops was to elect two committees of five each: one to examine applications for leave of absence; and the other to settle contests as to precedence, and similar matters, which contests at Trent often proved to be serious, indeed ere now the streets of Rome have witnessed bloodshed arising out of disputes of this sort between bishops. The members of these committees were called respectively Judges of Excuses and Judges of Complaints and Disputes. The mode of election was simple; every one wrote five names on a card. It proved that Fallibilists must not expect the smallest share of office. Cardinal De Luca took the chief place, and opened the Congregation with a few

simple sentences. These were translated by interpreters for the Orientals who did not understand Latin. The prelate who on this occasion celebrated Mass at the opening of the sitting was the Bishop of Osimo, afterwards Cardinal Vitelleschi, to whom some have ascribed the authorship of the work of his brother, which we often quote.¹

The real business of the day, too important to be left to the episcopate, had been done without them. It consisted in appointing the Commission of Proposals. Twelve cardinals, twelve archbishops, and two bishops were announced as the men whom the Pontiff had put in charge of the rights of their brethren. Prelates with titles from Antioch, Jerusalem, Thessalonica, and Sardis; one from Chili and one from Baltimore; one from Spain, one from Westminster, two Italians, and a few others, were empowered to say whether the men who ruled the sees of Paris, Lyons, Munich, Cologne, and Milan, and those of Hungary and Portugal, were or were not to be recommended to the Pope for permission to bring forward any proposal. The Commission could not grant them leave to do so, but it could report to the Pontiff, who alone could determine.

As some seven hundred and fifty bishops found all their hopes of proposing anything placed at the discretion of these twenty-six men, it was not for them to reason why: it was for them simply to read in the names now announced the record of past services and the fate of future suggestions.² They had not stayed the proceedings when they found that the Prosynodal Congregation had been used to fasten upon them an edict which took away their right of self-organisation, and it was now hopeless to attempt to recover that right. The three youngest archbishops on the list were Giannelli, Manning, and Deschamps; the secretary of the Nine, and the two hottest infallibilists,—all three on the way to the purple, which they have since received at one and the same time.

¹ *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, vol. v. p. 279.

² *Ibid.*, p. 18.

But the sensation of the day, perhaps brought about at this moment to divert attention from the painful inroad just made upon episcopal rights, was a Bull determining the course to be taken should the death of the Pontiff occur during the Council. This edict determined that the bishops must not, in that case, elect a successor or transact any business, but that the Council must be held as suspended till another Pope should be duly elected by the Cardinals alone, and till it should be again called together by him. Pius IX. ordained that this law should endure for ever, as the rule in all similar cases. This measure made the Council an appendage to the person of the Pope, not capable of sustaining its existence without him, and consequently having no imaginable power over him. It also made it inferior to the College of Cardinals,—an abnormal body, composed of ‘creatures’ of the crown, without any pretence to a constitutional place in the Christian Church,—‘Princes,’ and some of them, like Antonelli, not even priests. ‘Pivots,’ as their name imports, true ‘pivots’¹ of the Court, which has turned a religion into a school of costume, policy, and arms, they have, we repeat, as Cardinals, neither name nor place, neither order nor office, in the known constitution of the Catholic Church. When men who held that bishops were successors of the Apostles allowed the right of all the bishops in the world to choose their own head to be confiscated by an edict in favour of these Court officers, they were not likely afterwards to be strong supports of any true authority, only of that arbitrary will which finds all the sanction of its acts in itself. The Cardinals may well denounce nationalism, since to uphold their pretensions the mitres of all nations must bow to the hat of a prince in the suite of one little king. It would be unreasonable to think less of a man for wearing a scarlet hat and scarlet stockings, if his position in life calls him to it; almost as unreasonable as to think more

¹ The popular explanation ‘hinge’ is quite correct; the ancient hinge was a pivot inserted in a mortise, on which the door turned.

of him for it. But to put a prince into that grotesque Court dress, and then turn him, by virtue of his Court position, into a titular bishop, or archbishop, and to expect his irregular office to be recommended by his incongruous attire, is a proof of the unlimited faith of the Curia in costume.

The experience of the day taught two lessons. First, the hall proved to be utterly unfit for deliberation, as every architect or public speaker must have known that it would prove, though about twenty-four thousand pounds had been spent in adapting a space within the Cathedral. But the second lesson of the day's experience was of a different kind. It had become plain that Fallibilists and Infallibilists were to be parted off from one another by a hard official line, and that no distinction would be made between Fallibilists and Inopportunist. The Curia, instead of showing any fear of the minority, was evidently resolved on letting it be known that Rome was not the place to form an opposition. The Rules had in fact already disposed of the minority.

We have intimated that possibly theologians came up to the Council with no more knowledge of what awaited them than the bishops. This was at least the case with Friedrich. On the Monday after the opening ceremony, accompanied by Kagarer, theologian to his Grace of Munich, he waited on the Secretary of the Council. I knew, says the Professor, that at Trent every theologian was not entitled only, but bound, to take part in the labours of the Council, by preparing papers and publicly discussing questions. But, he adds, 'we were undeceived with a witness.' The Secretary told them that the duty of theologians in connection with the Council was 'nothing.' They were only to give information or advice to their respective bishops, as it might be asked for.

The decision thus announced to the doctors had been taken eleven months previously. The Nine, at their meetings of January 24th and 31st (*Cecconi*, p. 205), had determined that there should be no congregation of inferior theologians, as.

the doctors were called, in opposition to the bishops, the superior theologians. The open discussions which had given light to the people on the one side and to the prelates on the other were thus quenched. The people were no more to have any means of ascertaining what was being done with their creed, nor even, when something had been done, were they to have means of ascertaining what were the processes by which the new dogmas had been established. All that they were now to learn was to be the *fait accompli*, henceforth to become the standard of faith for all and in all. The order of priests was to be shorn of its last vestige of representation in the Councils of the Church. The bishops, on the other hand, were not to be allowed to know what could be said for or against a proposed dogma, before they were called upon to close it up for ever. This one turn of the screw wrung even from Cecconi a mild but distinct expression of doubt. He feels (p. 205) that 'the Fathers generally lost a mighty assistance in the discharge of their high office.' He ventures to quote Pallavicino, the Jesuit historian of Trent, whose language shows that the old Jesuits had broad views compared with those now ruling. Pallavicino's words remind us of the cry of poor Monsignor Liverani: We might be allowed to be Liberals up to the mark of Bellarmine:—

'Many of the bishops were learned in the science of theology, but the most eminent, as is the case in all sciences, were the private theologians, since they had not been diverted by public cares from regular study, without which eminent prudence is often acquired, but not eminent erudition.'

But Pius IX. had no intention of allowing bishops to satisfy their consciences by hearing all that could be said on both sides before they gave a judgment.

It would be hard to find a neater specimen of the terms in which the abolition of a venerable franchise may be couched than in the words of Cecconi. He lets us know that on the 4th of July, 1869, the Nine resolved to 'confer on the theo-

logians of bishops the right of being eligible to be called to serve the committees of the Council.' Should our Parliament resolve to deprive the Bar of the right of pleading at the bar of the House of Lords, the discreet way of phrasing it would be to say that it conferred on her Majesty's counsel the right of being eligible to be called upon to plead by and in secret committees of the Upper House. It would be only in keeping with a system of quotation regularly practised if this statement of Cecconi should be, hereafter, used to prove that the theologians at the Vatican Council did not suffer any curtailment of their rights, but received an increase of them. But exclusion from the right of pleading before 'my lords' was not all the degradation awaiting the unfortunate doctors. Bishop Fessler told them that they were free to give information or advice each to his own bishop, but, adds Friedrich, *only to him*. We wonder what man was not free to give private advice if asked for it. They were not to be allowed *to attend meetings of the bishops; not even to meet among themselves to consult in common upon questions affecting the Council.*¹ Friedrich was not the most to be pitied of the theologians. Father Ambrose, a Carmelite, had been brought up from Germany by his general, a Spaniard. At the first interview the general told him that the all-important question was that of Papal infallibility. Father Ambrose declared himself a Fallibilist, and produced a work which he had prepared on the subject. He at once lost his post; and the general wished to send him off to Malta. Cardinal Hohenlohe pleaded for his restoration, but in vain. The general feared that the order would be utterly put to shame if in addition to the scandal of the Cracow nun, and that of Father Hyacinthe's defection, a theologian of the Order brought up to the Council should be known as a Fallibilist. The poor man had even to go to Cardinal Hohenlohe, and to beg of him to give him back a copy of his little work which he had presented to his

¹ Compare *Quirinus*, 86, and *Tagebuch*, 25.

Eminence. This the Cardinal refused to do, saying that even if the general had ordered it, he had nothing to say to a Cardinal. Ambrose was permitted to return to Wurzburg, and before he started a prelate said to him, 'I should rejoice if any one recalled me or sent me home. We bishops have been ordered here to the Council without being told what we were to deliberate upon, and now that I know it, I could gladly turn my back upon the Council and Rome.'

Another minute touch of Friedrich at this moment shows how he heard a devoted Roman adherent of the Papacy say that an officer had sent him twenty scudi (about four pounds) as an offering to Peter's Pence; but he had returned the money, telling his friend he would do better to spend it on his family. 'His conscience had dictated this course,' for he knew how Peter's Pence were spent.

The correspondent of the *Stimmen* must have been under the triumphal influence of the opening, when he informed his German readers that wonderful unanimity reigned, and that what might be called the Opposition was daily shrinking up into nothing, and would soon reward only microscopical research.¹ The *Unità Cattolica* of January 1st alleged that the *Français*, in using the expression, 'A fraction of malcontents,' might possibly be right, if it meant an almost impalpable fraction; but if it meant anything more, it was false. The alleged discontent, it went on to say, was spoken of as if it related to the Commission of Proposals appointed by the Pope. Some were said to wish that the Council itself should have had the selection of a committee. It was false; no one complained. It could not be disputed that the Pontiff, having the right to convoke, rule, and guide the Council, had also the right to determine what questions should be submitted to it. Pius IX. had, indeed, himself confirmed this in the Bull by which he settled the Rules of Procedure. This is not conscious but unconscious irony. It reflects the course of the Papacy,

¹ *Stimmen*, N. F., vi., p. 170.

displaying its administrative force and its logical infirmity in one word. A right is first desired, then secretly assumed, next insinuated in indirect forms, and finally embodied in an act assuming it as already ascertained ; after which, this very act is taken as proof that it was previously established. When the Nine met, they confessed that it was questionable if the right existed to lay down rules for a General Council of the Catholic Church by a sub-committee of the Cardinals. But they assumed the right as unchallenged, embodied the assumption in an edict, and now turned to that edict as proof of the pre-existing right. A few days later, the correspondent of the *Stimmen* again said that, while the intelligence furnished to the ordinary journals was absurd, one thing might be relied upon, namely, that what was called an Opposition was daily diminishing.¹

Another Jesuit, writing after the Council, did not confirm these statements of the inspired organs, but followed the profane journals, whose intelligence was at the time decried :—

‘Behold,’ says Sambin, ‘two camps face to face ! On one side, Rome and her Sovereign Pontiff, surrounded by a vast majority of the bishops, displaying the banner of the Church as set up by her divine Redeemer. On the other side, an uncertain number of men belonging to all ranks of the hierarchy, seduced by illusory appearances or frightened by the danger of attacking modern ideas in front,—men who fancy that the Church ought to parley with the notions of the age.’²

The orthodox view on this point was expressed by the *Civiltá* in its first number after the Council was opened. ‘The press and public meetings are the two mainsprings by which the spirit of the age, or Masonry, or, to give things their proper names, Satan, moves public opinion for his own ends.’³ At that moment Satan was busy not only with the Italian and German press, but with the *Standard*, *Saturday Review*, and other English papers.

Another aspect of the Council was exhibited, not in the

¹ *Id.*, p. 172.

² *Sambin*, p. 41.

³ VII., ix., 6.

secular newspapers, but in the clerical periodicals. Eight days after the opening session, the *Stimmen* was informed how, on an afternoon as mild as summer, the grounds of the Villa Borghese were enlivened by a review in honour of the Fathers of the Council. The troops were much commended, not omitting the *Squadriglieri*, whom the Italians profanely charged with having been recruited from the brigands, but whom the Jesuits described as excellent Catholics. The *Civiltà* was really edified by this display. In the military review, it says—and we repeat word for word—the profane spectacle was dominated by the thought of the *new crusaders* defiling before so many bishops, spectators and a spectacle no longer witnessed at a military review. It was well and truly said that this review looked like a *function* in St. Peter's.¹

What is the meaning of 'a spectacle *no longer witnessed*'? Is it a reminiscence of days when bishops had armies of their own, with a hue of hope like that of M. Veuillot pointing to a time when provinces will insist upon having prefects to rule like bishops?

A few days later, the faithful, whose supply of news never related to either doctrine or discipline, were edified by an account of a performance in a military casino, in honour of the Austrian and Swiss bishops. It is inferred that the Pope's foreign troops must be highly educated, because the beautiful scenery had been entirely painted by the soldiers. The curtain represented St. Michael the Archangel overcoming the *first great rebel*. The first great rebel, by some wonderful prolepsis, was clad in a red shirt, and wore the features of Garibaldi. No writers so well know as the Jesuits how to make fun of Garibaldi's bit of ritualism, with his red shirt and poncho. A German war-song of the middle ages, addressed to St. Michael, was sung with loud applause, and sung *encore*. Cardinal Prince Schwarzenberg, the Archbishops of Salzburg and Cologne, the Bishop of Mainz, and the Prussian Military

¹ *Civiltà*, VII, ix., 108.

Bishop, with a retinue of counts and one prince, hallowed and graced the performance.¹

In spite of these diversions, and the protests and assertions of perfect unanimity made by the clerical writers, the indications which had for some time been making themselves obscurely felt of a Court party and an Opposition party, had at last emerged into painful consciousness on both sides. The idea of a sovereign above any party was too lofty for the place. One party, as we have seen stated by Sambin, was Rome and her Pontiff, while the other was an opposition, not against the opinions of Infallibilists, or the plans of a Cabinet, but against the Sovereign. Both sides had been very reluctant to acknowledge the reality of such antagonism, even long after its existence began to be tolerably evident. The Curia had nursed the hope, as we shall see, of all but unanimous adhesion to its pre-concerted plans. It reckoned on the ascendant of the Pope when in presence, on that of the Sacred College, on the sympathy of numbers, the witcheries of ceremony, the baits of promotion, and, if need should arise, on wholesome fear.

On the other hand, even the prelates who most feared what was about to be done, disliked the idea of being in opposition, not only to the Curia, but to the Pontiff, and that on a personal question. They flattered themselves, moreover, that the good feeling of the Pope would lead him to moderate his prompters, and would not allow him to expose bishops to difficulties, with

¹ The first number of the *Cirillo* for 1876 (p. 104) contains an account of an audience in which the Pope made a speech to pilgrims from Brittany. Among other things, calling to mind how, on the day of Pentecost, the mockers said that the disciples were full of new wine, he went on to say that there were not wanting leaders of the revolution shameless enough to call by such names as a gang of topers the ‘respectable and truly Christian youths who, forsaking domestic comfort, came to expose themselves even to blood in defence of this holy see.’ Liverani, as Canon of Santa Maria Maggiore, lamented his good opportunity, as living near barracks, of estimating the Christian virtues of the ‘Ecumenical Army.’ He says very hard things of them; and as to drunkenness makes no scruple of describing the Irish members of the force, in particular, as being not unmindful of home traditions that are no rule of faith, and a bad rule of practice.

their flocks and their governments, which they clearly foresaw. The men hoped that the general would modify his plans, and would win the campaign by strategy, without forcing them against stone walls.

Even before the opening, a painful feeling, according to Friedrich, had seized upon some of the bishops, when studying the Rules of Procedure. Fessler, he states, had told Dinkel, of Augsburg, that some dogmatic Decrees would be forthcoming on the opening day. Yet not a hint had been given as to what these Decrees might be; and such secrecy on matters so solemn was taken ill.¹ So far as the Curia was preparing a counter revolution, it acted only like any other political body in keeping its plans hidden. But it was a different matter to make secret preparations for effecting changes in a creed that men had taught until they were greyheaded, and then to expect them to face the alternative of either accepting the change or ruining their official prospects.

Scarcely had the opening session passed, when an address was signed by fourteen French prelates and the powerful Croatian Bishop Strossmayer, representing to the Pope in humble yet clear terms the danger of any restraint on the liberty of the Council. They did not rise in their places and move that the Council itself should frame its Rules of Procedure; they did not even move to accept the Rules laid before it in the Bull *Multiplices Inter*, with certain specified amendments. Nothing short of this would have asserted the freedom of their Assembly. On the contrary, like all men trained under absolutism, they did not know how to maintain their inherited rights against encroachment and at the same time to abide loyal and true; but submitted, grumbling at their wrongs, and groping for some opening in the wall which shut them in. Had they attempted to bring forward such a motion as we have supposed, it would soon have been seen whether the assertions were or were not true which were made by

¹ *Tagebuch*, pp. 18, 14.

English and American bishops about the Council being as free as the Senates of their own nations. Any one attempting to make such a proposal would have been informed that in the Pro-Synodal Congregation the Rules had been issued as a Papal Bull, and that in the first session the forms therein prescribed had been acted upon; so that those Rules, not being an act of the Council, but of the Pope, were not subject to revision by the Council; and, furthermore, that the Council had already practically adopted them. In fine, the prelates stood to some ideal Council in some such relation as we stand in to the Parliament; we cannot propose a motion, but we can send in a petition. Yet our petition would go to the House itself, not to the Cabinet. It would be named in the hearing of the House, and noted on its records. The petition of the poor bishops could not be presented in the Assembly, no trace of it is in the *Acta*; its only open way was to the steps of the throne. It was never answered, never mentioned in the official documents, and the faithful who sought information in the accredited organs that rang with charges of misrepresentation against worldly ones, never received a hint of any such transaction.

'Unless the thoroughness of examination and the perfect freedom of discussion are as clear as day,' say the fifteen prelates, it is to be feared that the effect will be to lower religion in public esteem and to aggravate the troubles of the Church.¹ The first point on which the petitioners fastened was the right of proposition. Yet, simple as this right was, they had not the courage to claim it. Perhaps even they were deceived, as Quirinus and many other writers evidently were,² at the first glance, by the way in which the denial of that right was veiled over in the Rules of Procedure. The mode of putting it is one often employed in the documents of the Roman Court.

¹ *Documenta ad Ill.*, Ab. II., p. 380. The exact date is not given, but only as 'before the 10th of December.'

² See *Quirinus*, p. 62.

When some serious restriction is to be announced, you may find at first a sentence or paragraph which conveys an impression of something different, perhaps opposite to what is to be the conclusion. Indeed, practised Liberal Catholics sometimes write as if with them it was a tacit canon of interpretation that when in Jesuit teaching you find a principle affirmed in the opening of a paragraph, that is the principle which is to be rendered nugatory by qualifications ere you reach the close ; and when you find a principle disclaimed, that is the principle which, under veils and covers, is to be set up.

In the Rules of Procedure the section on proposals did not say that no bishop should be permitted to propose anything in the Council, which was the thing meant. To plainly say what was meant, would be to copy the Tower of Babel, the wicked modern Parliament. The section said that though the right of bringing forward proposals belonged to the Pope alone, he wished the bishops freely to exercise it. This sufficed to set many writing good news home. They did not wait to weigh the following words. These showed that the right of proposition, handsomely announced to the Fathers of the Council, was just the right which everybody in the world possessed, that, namely, of forwarding a suggestion to the Pope. Curiously enough, even that common right was granted here only in a circuitous way, for the Pope himself named a Commission to receive propositions from the bishops, to consider them, and to report to him. If, after such report, he should wish any of them to come before the Council, he would send them forward. Most of the bishops, being unused to Parliamentary forms, began only by slow degrees to realise the fact that thus they had no right of proposition whatever. It was a good while before they became aware that they were simply in the position of private people. Anybody in Rome, or in Calcutta, could forward a suggestion to the Pope without going to a Royal Commission.

The address of the fifteen bishops requests that authors of

proposals shall be admitted to a hearing before the Commission, and also that the latter shall be required to assign reasons when it reports against any proposal. But the bishops do not even ask leave to put their suggestions upon the books. That would, at least, have given members the right of letting their fellow members know what they wished to see done. The idea of entering a notice of motion would of course have been in that atmosphere not liberty but licence. They do, however, venture to suggest that some members of the Commission might be elected by the Council. They also point out that secrecy cannot be really maintained. The address, as we have said, was not even answered.

Hergenröther, the writer on whose authority Cardinal Manning requires us to rely, devotes some strength to this question. He begins by affirming that in Trent there was no fixed order. His proof for that assertion is that there is no written Code of Procedure, the record showing only the course actually followed from time to time. He also asserts that the bishops in the Vatican Council *had perfect liberty* of proposition. He moreover informs those who learn from such as he, that in all great assemblies the right of the President includes that of proposition, at least so far as to give him the decision as to the order in which the proposals are taken.¹ Hergenröther, moreover, affirms that Friedrich wished to deny the right of proposition to the Pope,—a blunder arising from not distinguishing between a right and an exclusive right. The Directing Congregation made a distinction as singular as was this failure to distinguish on the part of Hergenröther. It held that the Pope had the direct right of proposition, and the bishops the indirect right. But the fact was that they had no right of proposing to the Council what-

¹ The statement of this writer is no worse than that of many bishops made in pastorals. It is this: *Den Bischöfen war vollständig ein Propositionsrecht zugestanden, welches nur der Controle der dafür bestimmten Deputation unterlag, ähnlich wie das auch zu Trient geschehen war.—Katholische Kirche und Christlicher Staat*, p. 50.

ever. They had no right beyond that of making a suggestion to the Pope, which, we repeat, anybody in the world could do; the only difference being that the one suggestion went before a Royal Commission, while the other did not.

The Directing Congregation had been first of all inclined to let the Fathers choose a committee of their own, but finally determined that the Pope himself should appoint a commission. Of course they call it a committee. This was an arrangement open to objections which even they did not wholly fail to see; but the Court historian finds a perfect answer by saying that if a good proposal should rest unheeded the author of it would have the satisfaction of having done his duty, and he must trust to divine Providence, which would never fail the Church.¹ Clouds of words were raised about this simple matter. The Catholics made solemn asseverations that the bishops had as perfect liberty of proposition as the members of any public body. The Liberal Catholics protested that they had not. They were cried down as slanderers. The official records will not cause the recall of a word of all those contradictions of facts as palpable as that two and two make four.

Hefele, a learned German, gave confused and even contradictory advice as a consulter; first contending that the bishops should have a right of proposition, and then suggesting the very arrangements finally adopted, as if he had first used his German learning to establish the general principle, and then had allowed some practical Roman to tell him how it should be carried out. Sanguineti, a Roman consulter, knew both his own mind and how to adapt means to ends. He plainly stated what was to be aimed at, namely, that the Pope alone should have the right of public proposition, leaving to the bishops what he calls the right of private proposition; as the Directing Congregation calls it, of indirect proposition, or, as we call it, of suggestion. He held that the bishops must

¹ *Cecconi*, p. 162.

not have the right of negative proposition; that is, the right of forbidding any proposition to be brought forward. He would also deprive them of the right of positive proposition; that is, the right of bringing forward anything on their own motion. Of course, then, the public right, the negative right, and the positive right, were all to be concentrated exclusively in the Pope, *ad sanctam sedem unice pertinere*.¹

The result, then, was that the bishops could not bring in any substantive motion, could not move for a subject to be taken into consideration, could not put a notice of motion on the books, could not move an amendment on what the President proposed, could not move the previous question, could not move to decline taking the matter into consideration, could not move to postpone it. All that they could do was to speak to what the President proposed, to send suggested amendments before a committee, and finally to vote Yea or Nay upon the question, in the form into which that committee ultimately put it. No minutes of proceedings were printed, or even read day by day. No knowledge was allowed to speakers

¹ *Cecconi*, p. 160. Hefele, when recommending that the bishops should have the right of proposition, quotes what occurred at the Council of Trent, when the Archbishop of Capaccio-Vallo, on the 10th of May, 1546, repelled the claim of the Legate, Cardinal De Monte, to the exclusive right of proposition. The Archbishop cried, 'What am I to do if anything occurs to me which ought to be proposed in this holy Council?' To this De Monte replied, that if either his Grace or any other prelate wished to propose anything, they must submit it to the Legates, who would bring it forward, if they thought well. But should the latter unjustly, or without cause, refuse to bring it forward, then the author, whoever he was, should himself do so. But Hefele does not point to the fact that De Monte made this concession only after being driven to it by force of opposition. Earlier in the very same day, he had asserted the exclusive right of the Legates to propose, and had been confronted by the Cardinal Archbishop of Trent with the plump declaration that he did not want to take the right of proposition from the Legates, but he thought he also might propose what seemed to him right. Then the Legate and the Cardinal, who had been for some time engaged in a passage of arms, apologised to one another. That, however, did not prevent De Monte from again attempting to establish the claim of the chair to the exclusive right of proposition, by once more asserting it. It was on this second attempt that the Archbishop of Capaccio-Vallo reclaimed, and then the Legate had, with ill grace, to give way. (See *Acta Genuina*, vol i., pp. 100, 101.)

even of the reports taken of their own speeches; no sight of the reported speeches of others.

It need not be said to any but Romish bishops that this means abolishing even the show of free councils. He who cannot propose measures may be a critic, but is no judge; may be a debater, but is no legislator. Excepting in the one particular of giving a vote, the editors of our journals have larger practical rights as to measures proposed by our government than the poor prelates of the Vatican Council had as to those prepared by theirs. Yet the journalists are critics and no more, but with the incalculable advantage of speaking the mother-tongue, of criticising in daylight, not in a cave constituted by an oath of secrecy, and of criticising a government which does not hold in its power either their income or their professional status.

Notwithstanding all this, bishop after bishop returned from the Council to denounce in pastorals those who had said that they had not the liberty of proposition. Even our English tongue had to make itself the vehicle of such statements for two mighty nations. Bishop bore witness to bishop, and they were true and all men were liars. Archbishop Manning told how bishops 'of the freest country in the world' had *said truly*, 'The liberty of our Congress is not greater than the liberty of the Council.'¹ We fear that American bishops might have quoted similar declarations from English ones. It is for members of Congress and of Parliament to judge.

La Liberté du Concile is a tract which, Friedrich says, if not written by Darboy, was inspired by him.² Only fifty copies were printed during the Council, for distribution exclusively among the Cardinals, and with the strictest injunctions of secrecy. The whole is given in the *Documenta ad Illustrandum*.³ It is introduced by an article from the *Moniteur* of the 14th February, 1870. One of its earliest sentences compresses the secret history of Cecconi

¹ *Priv. Pet.*, Part III., p. 32.

² *Doc. ad Ill.*, ii., p. vi.

³ I., 129.

into a few words. ‘The first unhappy thought, and that from which the Council now suffers, was the wish, so to speak, to make the Council beforehand, and to make it without the bishops.’ It is right to mention that M. Veuillot says that this writer recounts ill, reasons worse, and draws inferences worst of all.¹

For two years, complains this writer, the bishops had been refused any program. They had not been afforded any possibility of studying questions about to be raised, or of preparing themselves to discuss them.² It would seem that the writer did not know that the preparations had extended over five years instead of two. He says that the Council had not made its Rules of Procedure ; the Pope had imposed them. It had not chosen one of its officers, not even a scrutineer ; the Pope had selected them all beforehand. The reason for the restraints imposed on the liberty of the bishops was stated by M. Veuillot as being to take away the liberty of evil, which the writer considers an insult to the bishops. We may remark that this is a principle which, had it been acted upon by the great government above us all, would have precluded every question as to the origin of evil. This tract affirms that the Commission for Proposals was composed exclusively of declared partisans of the Court. That statement is not quite accurate. Rauscher was a mighty instrument of the Curia in its ordinary aggressions on the civil power, but too sensible to approve of its present projects. Cardinal Corsi also, though at last he voted with the majority, was all along reputed as averse to the definition of infallibility. The next complaint is that the Committees for the important subjects of Dogma, Discipline, the Religious Orders, and Oriental Affairs, are permanent, chosen once for all, and chosen by a strictly party vote, excluding every Fallibilist. Thus, is it urged, only ninety-six bishops out of nearly eight hundred would ever know anything of those real delibera-

¹ I., p. 275.

² This complaint is ably put in the *Rheinischer Merkur*, first number.

tions which principally determine the results of the Council. These Committees would have to decide upon all alterations to be made in Drafts of Decrees after the first Drafts had been discussed by the bishops generally. They would have the sole responsibility of bringing them forward in the definitive shape in which they must be voted upon, Yea or Nay. Thus, he repeats, seven hundred out of eight hundred are absolutely excluded from a share, at any time whatever, in the most important operations of the Council. The indignation of the author would not have been lessened had he known that this particular point had been carefully weighed by the Nine. They at first resolved to allow the Council to elect, as had been done at Trent, committees for each particular matter as it arose. It was, however, subsequently foreseen that this regulation might open the way to the election of men who were not safe. After a discussion, a man who had displayed ability in treating the matter in hand might be elected on the committee for that reason alone! If, on the other hand, committees were chosen once for all, it would be easy to secure the exclusion of wrong names in that one election, and no opportunity of changing them would ever arise.¹ By this means, as Vitelleschi indicates, each committee would form a continuation of the Secret Commission, which, previously to the Council, had treated the affairs to be entrusted to it. M. Veuillot makes the Bishop of Orleans primarily responsible for the exclusive character of the committees. His trumpet had given the signal of war. In the face of the Pope and of the doctrine of the Church stood, in appearance if not in reality, a chief and a doctriné of opposition. In face of the Universal Bishop stood one who was called the European Bishop. Therefore was the Opposition put on one side (i, p. 285). The writer of *La Liberté du Concile* proceeds to say that a number of bishops urgently requested the Pope, in order to ensure a wise selection of these all-controlling committees, to direct

¹ *Cecconi*, pp. 181, 182.

that the Fathers should be divided into groups, and should in these discuss pending questions separately, on the plan adopted in the *Bureaux* of the French and Italian Chambers. Thus the Fathers, who for the most part were perfect strangers to one another, would in a little time learn who were the capable men, and would be in a position to make a proper selection. This appeal, probably the one we have already mentioned, was not even answered.

The lords of wide dioceses, accustomed to rule their clergy with military authority and to face statesmen with considerable pretensions, were now reduced to struggle for very small liberties. They attempted to form themselves into groups, by nation or by language. So far as the French were concerned, this arrangement failed. Each of their two Cardinals, De Bonnechose and Matthieu, received a group in his own house. Cardinal De Bonnechose would not consent that all the French bishops should meet together. Even when they divided, he went for advice to Antonelli, who intimated that they ought not to meet in *larger groups than fifteen or twenty*. The effect of all this was, that when the time for making arrangements for the election of the committees came, they had no concert among themselves; and the writer states that after that election, the annoyances confronting Cardinal Matthieu were so great, that he felt obliged for a time to leave Rome. Hereupon the bishops who had previously met at his house resolved to go to that of Cardinal De Bonnechose, who had, for once, to receive them; but he again consulted Antonelli, and declared that this first general meeting should also be the last.

The bishops desired to select the best men of their own nation to be nominated as members of the permanent committees. The Curia, however, had provided for all that. The 'ticket' of Cardinal De Angelis, as it would be called in America, was the counter move. The German and Hungarian bishops had shown more cohesion than the French. They met together, and made a selection of the principal men

from their own number; but that resulted in nothing. The Curia had selected those whom it preferred, setting aside the men who stood high with their fellow-countrymen, and putting forward those who with them would have had no chance. An official list was prepared bearing the name of Cardinal De Angelis. Of course the bishops *in partibus*, the missionary bishops, and all the mere dependents of the Court, voted for the official list; and thus the whole of the four permanent committees were composed, as the secret preparatory commission had been, exclusively of the nominees of the Curia. The Jesuit press gloried over this result. M. Veuillot said that the Committee on Faith was an echo of the great commission appointed by the Pope. Sambin recorded the triumph, with satisfaction, for permanent history. The result showed that the Court could count on about 550 votes.¹ De Angelis was appointed to the vacant post of Chief President, in room of Reisach. Cardinal Schwarzenberg was not on any committee, Hohenlohe was out of the question. Even the Archbishop of Cologne was only on a petty committee for granting leave of absence. But Bishop Senestrey, of Regensburg, the author of the throne-upsetting speech, was on the all-important committee for dogma.

This manœuvre excited strong indignation amongst all shades of the marked men. They found themselves shut off from such a part in deliberations as would have been granted by any worldly cabinet to an honourable Opposition. Then, the mode of securing the result by the expedients of a political election caused bitter recollections of frequent admonitions, given both verbally and in the press, not to reason about the Council as an ordinary human assembly, but to evince a worthy confidence in the all-guiding power of the Holy Ghost. The *Rheinischer Merkur* remarked that the Romans had a saying, that at the beginning of a conclave the devil reigns, then the world carries all before it, and only at the last does

¹ *Acton*, 68.

the Holy Ghost turn both out and regulate things according to his own will. This genuine specimen of Roman mockery is applied to the Council by the *Merkur* saying that as yet the third stage had certainly not set in.¹ The selection, said the *Merkur*, of committees was onesided and narrow-minded. The Archbishop of Paris and the Bishop of Orleans saw themselves thrown aside, and nominal bishops put in the places they ought to have occupied. The German bishops who had strongly confided in the moderation of the Curia, found that no amount of trimming would avail; nothing short of a sound profession on the question of infallibility. Vitelleschi says that the clearest, most sincere and disinterested opposition was that of the German bishops. They knew what they meant, and also knew that they expressed the collective sense of their people; besides, they always acted with moderation. He ascribes this moderation to two causes, namely, the fact that they consciously did express the views of their people, and that they were, more or less, influenced by Protestant modes of thinking. We confess that we see little proof that any German bishops but the curialistic ones were clear. We should rather have said that they were at sea. As to the moderation, however, Vitelleschi adds that no such moderating influence of Protestant opinion appeared in the case of the English prelates. 'Several bishops, with Manning at their head, more Catholic than the Pope, are noted for their Ultramontanism' (p. 45). He adds, that even the Irish bishops were less uniformly Infallibilists than the English. Of the Belgians, he says that some naturally took the more liberal direction. De Mérode, well known in Rome as a Court prelate, placeman, and speculator, like Dupanloup, had been a champion of the temporal power, but now proved to be an anti-infallibilist. *Et tu Brute fili mi!* exclaims the Roman. As to the Spaniards, Vitelleschi says that they had been trained in the school of Torquemada; and

¹ Vol. i., p. 2.

if they were content with being only Ultramontanes, that was something gained. These are the divines of whom Quirinus says that if ordered by the Pope to vote that there were four persons in the Trinity, they would do it. Vitelleschi remarks that the prelates of the United States were simpler than their brethren, and less practised in ecclesiastical politics. Their want of any political importance at home, he believes, had predisposed them to warmer sympathy with curialistic views than might have been expected from them. Nevertheless, it proved in time that, under the forms of ecclesiastical discipline, the spirit of citizens of a free country did now and then make its appearance among them. Another of his remarks is, that, with the exception of Portugal, most of the bishops from small countries were in the interest of the Curia. Speaking of Mermillod, from Geneva, Quirinus says that he 'rivals Manning in his fanatical zeal for the new dogma.' Of course the Italian bishops, with very few exceptions, were Infallibilists, and those from South America were all upon the same side. The bulk of the Opposition bishops were German, Hungarian, and French, reinforced by some of the older ones from Ireland, a few of the English, a good many of the North American, and only about twenty of the entire body of the Italian.

The various groups had now everything to stimulate them to put their proposals into shape. Those of the Curia were in shape already. They naturally took the old direction of conforming the creed to innovations in practice. At Trent this was done with many innovations, which must either fall into discredit or be lifted above dispute. In this way was the demand for a reform of the Church to raise her to the level of the creed, met by a determination to bring down the creed to the level of the Church. The two movements were confronted. Reformation, on the one side, renovating the condition of the Church; and Conformity, on the other side, adulterating the creed. Both together resulted in the wide separation

which has been witnessed ever since. The necessity now pressing sprang from different causes. No party had arisen to challenge the primacy of the Pope, even in the form of all but unlimited monarchy, into which, under cover of the gentle word 'primacy,' it had been monstrously developed. On the contrary, indeed, of late years the faithful had shown increasing submissiveness, proportioned to the dangers surrounding the Pope. But the Papacy itself was moving for constitutional powers which demanded a new dogmatic basis.

In comparison with the magnificence of the scheme of one fold and one shepherd, as it floated before the imagination of the real reformers of the moment, the notions of the German bishops, as disclosed by Friedrich, are an illustration of how administrators potter when immense issues press for solution. While the architects were designing a new coliseum, the joiners and stone-cutters were great upon cusps and corbels. In answer to the seventeen questions issued in Rome at the centenary of St. Peter, the German bishops had deliberated at Fulda for five days. They appear to have taken the questions as intended to call out suggestions for administrative reform, and so we presume they were, when looked at from the centralising point of view, for they evidently aimed at tracing existing divergencies in administration, in order to place in the hands of the bureaux perfect means for making every joint of the machinery move in gear. Marriage, as a mine yielding richly to the local authorities in fees, and to the Curia in dispensation taxes, and also as a means of power over females, and over the education of children, was naturally one of the main points. Another point included the offences for which parish priests should be liable to deposition. On this the bishops advised the addition of two offences to the list,—notorious fornication and open concubinage.

Hints were thrown out about abolishing all benefices, as they were said to be feudal. The clergy could not be fully mobilised but by the abolition of permanent appointments.

The whole effect of the questions was to bring out the existence in Germany of too great toleration of intercourse with Protestants; intercourse to a degree not consistent with the militant footing on which things were to be put. This applied to christenings, weddings, burials, and other events of life, where the milk of human kindness sometimes will overflow, and men will forget that they belong to a society which scarcely regards those who are not of it as morally entitled to existence. The bishops naturally desired that the number of *causae maiores*, or reserved cases, should be curtailed, as that would increase their own freedom and power. They also expressed a wish that censures should not be enforced against Catholic judges who found themselves obliged to pronounce sentences adverse to the canon law. This they advised in order to avoid the exclusion of Catholics from the judicial bench. They moreover suggested that unreasonably contracting debts and habitual drunkenness should be added to the list of causes warranting the removal of a priest. They did touch a few minute points of a properly religious kind, connected with the forgiveness of sins, ordination, and other questions.

Friedrich remarks that these ideas tended to the omnipotence of the bishops by sacrificing the parish priests. This object, however, was a natural complement of the sacrifice of the bishops to the Curia. If the bishop is himself an absolute dependent on the Court, all his subordinates must be left to his mercy. The Curia knew how to lure on the bishops to the forfeiting of their own franchises, by using their love of power against the franchises of the priests.

Friedrich gravely says that the movableness of the parish priests would not cure the moral evils complained of. ‘It is not by outward correction that a man becomes morally better, but by the ennobling of the inner man, which, alas, is so little aimed at among the clergy. When a French bishop can say in the Senate, “My clergy are a regiment; they are bound to march, and they do march,” he only shows how the Christian

spirit has evaporated from among the hierarchy.' A few weeks before Friedrich left home, he had conversed with Döllinger upon the seventeen questions, and he says that they were the only points respecting the Council on which they did converse together. What the aged provost said, observes Friedrich, will always remain in my memory. 'On one occasion, Windischmann remarked in my presence and that of others, "If I was compelled to answer according to the contents of the ordinary's book, whether celibacy should be abolished or not, I should have to speak unconditionally for its abolition."

We have seen, in a previous chapter, that some of the lower clergy had indicated plans of considerable range, but they pointed in a direction in which Rome was incapable of going. Great attention was attracted by a project, appearing with the name of a learned layman in Switzerland, Dr. Segesser.¹ His charter had no less than twelve points, which are well worth a moment's notice.

1. He held that the Church, in having, for the first time in her history, declined to invite the co-operation of governments with the Council, must now declare for the separation of Church and State.
2. The Council must be a Reform Council in the fullest sense of the word.
3. It must certify the freedom of its members to the world.
4. It must be declared that all who believe in the redeeming work of Christ belong to the Christian communion.
5. No dogma must be added unless urgently called for, not only by theologians, but by the faithful.
6. The primacy being divine, but the Papacy being only a joint product of Roman jurisprudence and theology, the dogma of the pontifical infallibility of the Pope, which would lead back to theocratic ideas, would set the Church and State on a war of mutual annihilation. Therefore it is the absolute duty

¹ Reviewed in the *Literaturblatt*, vol. v., p. 157.

of the Church to declare herself completely released from the theocratic ideas of the great Popes of the middle ages.

7. The question of infallibility must not be passed over in silence, but must be solemnly declared to be in opposition to the right idea of the constitution of the Church.

8. In mixed questions, such as those of the Church and State, laymen should have some voice.

9. The temporal power must be treated as a local Roman institution, and not confounded with the affairs of the universal Church.

10. Freedom of teaching, of organisation, and of worship, and equality with all other communions, must be proclaimed ; and the Church would do well if she gave up all claim to the immunity of her property, and placed it entirely under the control of the common law.

11. The Index to be given up.

12. We give this in full : 'The Christian State was a great ideal, but a yet greater is a State of Christians. To attain to the last the Church must not domineer, but must possess freedom, and give it.'

The language of this Liberal Catholic, brought up among German Protestants on the one hand and Swiss ones on the other, would sound altogether alien to the ears of the Cardinals, and would only deepen their painful impression of the evil influences of Protestant teaching upon the children of the Church. Enough occurred at the Council to show that, even among the bishops, there were one or two who would have dared to propose some of the points in Dr. Segesser's scheme, had the members of the Council been permitted to make proposals.

CHAPTER III.

Further Party Manceuvres—Election of Permanent Committees—Bull of Excommunications—Various opinions of it—Position of Antonelli—No serious Discussion desired—Perplexities of the Bishops—Reisach's Code suppressed—It may reappear—Attitude of Governments.

AUTHORS differ as to the actors in an incident which marked the second General Congregation, on Dec. 14th. Quirinus and Fromman say that Darboy and Strossmayer (Friedrich says that Dupanloup and Strossmayer) attempted to speak on the Rules of Procedure, but were stopped by Cardinal De Luca, on the ground that what the Holy Father had decreed could not be discussed. The official writers at the time said not a word of the incident, nor is it named in the *Acta Sancte Sedis*, nor in *Frond*.

Thus the bishops had now ascertained their position, but too late. Quirinus naturally says that had the assembly been, in some measure, prepared for the Rules, there would have been opposition; but good care had been taken that the assembly should not be prepared, and should not have any chance of offering opposition. The first gleam of hope, adds this author, excited by the announcement that the bishops would be allowed to propose measures, had speedily vanished. Lord Acton says (p. 63): 'The bishops felt themselves in an entangled position. Some began to speak of going home. Some complained that the Rules foreclosed questions involving divine rights, and said that they felt bound to put even the existence of the Council to stake.'

The election of the Permanent Committee on Dogma was the great work of the day. Archbishop Kenrick's Latin note¹ states that lithographed lists were distributed some days before the election, with the inscription, *To the honour of Mary, conceived Immaculate;* and that these lists were

¹ *Documenta ad Illustrandum*, i., 245.

recommended by the name of Cardinal De Angelis. Four hundred of the votes sent in gave the list entire. It was by these tactics that every Fallibilist, without exception, was excluded from the committees. But Canon Pelletier, who wrote what in *Frond* passes for the history of the Council and is a good history of the ceremonies and the dresses, declares that the election proved the perfect freedom of the Fathers, for though all the names on the official list were chosen, they were not brought in according to the order in which they stood on that list. The French prelates of the minority were especially incensed, both against their leaders and against those whose superior tactics had frustrated their unskilful attempts to unite. Every Frenchman felt that all who represented the traditions and the spirit of the Roman Catholic Church in France were now, in Rome, placed under a species of ostracism. The Fathers left this exciting sitting with another Bull in their hands. Again Letters Apostolic to the present! The *Acta Sanctæ Sedi* affirm that the work of preparing this Bull could not be got through in time to send it to the Fathers before the Council. Its title was gentle. It was a Bull to Limit the Censures of the Church. Quirinus mentions a mission undertaken by Cardinal Pitra, a Frenchman, with the intention of bringing the prelates of his own country into accord with the Curia. This he followed up by a similar attempt with the German bishops. Pitra began by describing Dupanloup to the latter as 'a mischievous teacher of error,' but he was stopped, and told that the Germans agreed with Dupanloup.

A favourite topic of conversation now was the chance of disorganising the Opposition. The first checks appeared to have had the effect of consolidating it, but the resources of the Court were generally assumed to be efficacious. Over and over again was it asserted that the hope of a robe of some distinguishing hue, or of a title on the list of domestic prelates of the Pope, would win over almost any bishop

an assertion which proved not to be correct.¹ Quirinus, in common with German writers generally, speaks of the honour of being on that list as one that ought to be coveted rather by menials than by dignitaries; and Italians may often be heard saying much the same thing. Again, faculties enabling a bishop to give absolution, or dispensations, in certain reserved cases, yield to him both power and fees. ‘Nine bishops out of ten want favours’—an assertion of Quirinus—seems bold, but it was written in Rome.

The Bull professing to limit the censures of the Church, was found to be another case of a winning title to a dreadful document. The censures with which it dealt were only a portion out of Rome’s store, those, namely, under which one falls by the very act of committing the offence, without any need of trial or sentence. They are called offences *Latæ Sententiae*, or judged already. He that confesses to one such act is, *ipso facto*, excommunicate, or, in the less heinous cases, ‘suspended.’ The Bull, as we have said, professed to limit the number of these cases; many of which represent multitudes in all Roman Catholic countries, who must either shun the confessional, knowing that in that tribunal they are judged already, or must go to it to find themselves pronounced outside of the kingdom of grace, and incapable of restoration except by special powers granted from Rome, which always imply special fees.

It was freely said, This is a re-issue of the Bull *In Cœna Domini*, the terrible syllabus of excommunications, at one time annually published; a custom which had ceased since the days of Clement XIV. This cessation was often cited as indicating greater mildness in the spirit of the Roman Court. In the new Bull *Apostolicae Sedis* these excommunications reappeared. They were under different heads. Three classes were reserved

¹ Of those domestic prelates the *Annuario Pontificio* for 1870 gives above two hundred and thirty names; the list in 1875 is over four hundred, in the *Gerarodia Cattolica e la Famiglia Pontificia*.

to bishops, so that no ordinary priest could release from them. Twenty-nine classes were reserved to the Pontiff, so that no bishop could release from them. Four classes were not reserved to any one.¹ Some bishops declared that they found excommunications here of which they had never been aware up to that moment. Vitelleschi said that if some found in old books were omitted, the Bull re-enacted all of the penal code of the Church that was in force. According as men looked at this document, from a fiscal, hierarchical, or monarchical point of view, their appreciation of it varied. Beyond excommunicating all heretics and heretical books, with the readers, abettors, and so forth, it dealt with few matters which any true theologian would not gladly banish from his bounds, as trespassers.

The hierarchical aspect of the Bull was striking. More than one of its sections pronounced excommunication upon the sin of appealing from any act of the Pope to a future General Council. This was the mortal blow to the doctrine that a Council could judge, and even depose, the Pope, as Councils had done. Being issued in the face of a General Council actually sitting, no alternative remained but that of conflict between the Council and the Pope, or else final abandonment of this once vigorous doctrine. The defiant crowings of the Gallican cock were for ever hushed by this one grip in the claws of the Vatican eagle. This Bull, as compared with the action of the Council of Constance, which deposed two Popes, and itself elected one, served to measure the decline of the episcopal and the growth of the pontifical power in the Church. Many of the bishops were old enough to have maintained the doctrine that the Council was above the Pope, against Protestants, who innocently accused all Roman Catholics of being Papists. If any one of them thought

¹ Though issued during the Council, this Bull is not, like the others, printed in the *Acta*. It is in the Freiburg edition, p. 77; and also in *Acta Sanctae Sedis* v., p. 287.

of standing by the old flag, what was he to do? To put a notice of motion on the books? That was not permitted. To send a suggestion to the Twenty-six? It might as well go into his own waste-paper basket as into theirs. To speak upon the point? That would be out of order, for bishops were to speak only on matters proposed, and nothing was to be proposed but what the Pope proposed. Moreover, even if in speeches irrelevant matter should be allowed, such matter as that now contemplated would be at once pronounced rebellion. It would be an attempt to discuss what the Holy Father had already decreed. Thus the question of the relative judicial powers of the single Bishop of Rome, and of all the other bishops of the world collectively, was settled by an arbitrary sentence, uttered in the face of all the bishops assembled in conclave; and their assembly, though called a General Council, had no liberty to canvass the decision!

It was a hard dilemma for a man to be placed in who had a sense either of human rights or of a divine office to defend. But the hand of power was over the bishops. No man who opposed even embryo Decrees could ever reasonably hope for a hat; and he who should venture to attack a Bull actually issued must expect to see his mitre reduced to an empty dignity by the withdrawal of his faculties. So the bishops saw a Bull which 'thrust the souls entrusted to them by thousands out of the Church'; and what could they do? 'The more excommunications, the more perplexed and tormented consciences,' cries Quirinus,—reminding us of what might often be heard in the old times from thoughtful men in Rome. The whole effort of the priests, they would say, is to keep the conscience in agony, or at least in unrest; for this drives people to the confessor, and hence no end of gains.

A diplomatist regarded the political aspects of the Bull as serious.¹ Excommunicating men for an appeal to a General

¹ *Tagebuch*, p. 82.

Council was, as he took it, both the forerunner and the application of the dogma of infallibility. Excommunicating all who should punish bishops, or higher officers of the Church, without making an exception for any breach whatever of law, and, moreover, excommunicating any who, directly or indirectly, should obstruct the execution of Papal mandates, were not only blows but stabs at all civil authority. The diplomatist argued that the way in which the Pope abolished privileges granted by his predecessors was a poor pledge of the value of any engagements into which the Papacy might enter. The diplomatist ought to have known that the immunity of the clergy from lay jurisdiction was an essential part of the restoration to be accomplished. He ought also to have known that 'the free communication' of the Pope with the faithful, or his right to promulge in all countries his decrees as their highest law, was equally essential. Setting up the national authority against that of the Pope was setting the less above the greater, the part above the whole. The excommunication, not only of heretics, but of all who should harbour or defend them, ay, or should even read their books, led Vitelleschi to raise a question for young theologians, whether the Pope has not excommunicated himself and his own government, seeing he had done more than harbour heretics in an inn, by allowing them a church outside the *Porta del Popolo*.

The Bull, said some, is only one of a series of measures to be framed, assuming the infallibility of preceding Popes. This was of the essence of a restoration both of ideas and of facts. The dispute as to Bulls which taught any dogma in theology or morals must for ever end. The judgments in them pronounced must take their place among divine judgments. The very points which Liberal Catholics had alleged to be without binding force must be beyond appeal bound on earth, and of course ratified in heaven. A little circumstance not without significance was the fact that, in publishing this document, the *Civiltà* did not, as it usually does with official documents,

furnish a translation of the Latin ; and the *Stimmen*, for Germany, followed the example.

In Germany or other Protestant countries an unfavourable impression might be taken of the means to be resorted to for restoring Papal ascendancy when, in the terrible category of offences judged already, without power to remit the sentence being reserved to any one, even to the Vicar of God, were found the following deeds, which many Christians would do with as cool a sense of duty as that with which under slave-laws they would have befriended a fugitive slave :—‘Injuring or intimidating Inquisitors, informers, witnesses, or other ministers of the Holy Office ; tearing up or burning the papers of its sacred tribunal ; or giving to any of the aforesaid aid, counsel, or favour.’ If the day ever comes for attempting to put this law in force on the now happy soil of England, blessed among her sons or daughters will that one be who first has grace to endure the torments of the Holy Office rather than not break the wicked law !

The fiscal bearing of the Bull would be the one first to strike and most to occupy the Romans. Among men of the different orders, it would occasion many a chat over questions of sin, sacraments, crime, communion, dispensation, remission, and redemption from purgatory, and of the fees flowing from each respectively. Quirinus represents the Jesuits as beholding both the present and the future in rosy hues. The bishops would not be able to give absolution in the reserved cases, but the Jesuits, in very many of them, would have plenary power. Hence the bishops and the parochial clergy would suffer both in fees and influence, while the confessionalists of their powerful rivals would be thronged. ‘So, each of those multiplied excommunications is worth its weight in gold to the Order, and helps to build colleges and professed houses.’¹ Against the complaints which greeted the Bull, the *Civiltá* alleged that it contained nothing new, and above all that it had been

¹ *Quirinus*, p. 106.

posted up in the customary places in Rome, and was therefore already the law of the Church universal. It was, on the other hand, boldly alleged that there were many new cases of suspension, interdict, or excommunication. Cardinal Antonelli, however, said that there were three hundred excommunications which were not included in the Bull. Lord Acton (p. 70) quotes a passage from the organ of the Archbishop of Cologne, which shows that a good many more will have to be added before all actions are placed under perfect control. The Bull, it is said, does not prohibit 'the works of Jews, since Jews are not heretics ; nor does it prohibit heretical pamphlets and journals, for these are not books ; nor is the hearing of heretical books when read aloud forbidden, since hearing is not reading.'¹

Some doubt hangs round the feeling of Cardinal Antonelli as to the Council. It was often asserted that he had been opposed to it from the first, and was still decidedly so. This seems very probable. A worldly-wise man, capable of amassing a colossal fortune amid the ruins of a petty State, was hardly likely to believe that the *d priori* fabric of Tarquini and the other Jesuits, and the hot-headed schemes of the Pope, were solid enough to bear what was to be built upon them, or would lead to anything but defeat of the Papacy, and misery to the nations. But in contradiction to this view, Quirinus says that Antonelli was too good a statesman and financier not to see the gain that would flow from the new dogma in power and revenue. The new dogma would doubtless enormously increase the power of the Curia within the Church and over all her organisations. It would thus increase the facility of bringing pressure to bear on a government by

¹ An illustration of the practical application of this Bull is furnished in the pastoral of the Bishop of Quebec, quoted in the *Montreal Herald* for October 21st, 1875 :—'Pius IX. in his Bull *Apostolicae Sedis* declared that those fall under a minor excommunication who, directly or indirectly, oblige lay judges to arraign ecclesiastical persons before their tribunal.'

A manual edition of the Bull is published at the office of the Propaganda, with notes of value, by Father Pietro Avanzini, editor of the *Acta Sanctorum Sedis*.

threats of disaffection and agitation; but it would at the same time arouse all statesmen, and eventually all intelligent men, except real disciples, against this sacerdotal empire. The most likely explanation of any zeal Antonelli may have shown for the new order of things would perhaps be that while retaining his own view of the risks about to be run, he knew that what was to be was to be, and determined to make the best of it. He could therefore well show diplomatists how the exaltation of the authority of the Pontiff would be the stay of all authority, and could show bishops how it would exalt the supernatural order above the natural.

Papers immediately preceding the Bull in the pages of the *Civilità*¹ seemed to indicate steadiness in the purpose either to bend the States or to break them. One article rang the changes on the old theme of the royal *placet* or *exequatur*, 'the crime whereby ecclesiastical judgments are submitted to lay examination.' It quoted strong congratulations addressed by the Pope to a Neapolitan author, who wrote denouncing, in the track of Tarquini, the remaining vestiges of national rights, upheld against the Vatican. It once more asserted its old position, as being triumphantly proved by this author that 'the Church is not a State within the State, that the political State is subordinate to the Church, and, finally, that it is not the Church which is in the State, but the State which is in the Church.' 'The Church,' it adds, 'is not a foreign power, and hence concludes that the State has no right of precaution *jus cavendi*, in respect of her.' The internal power on which the Curia counts, in any country, being that of threatening political agitation, the denial to the State of all right of precaution is essential to the full application of the principle of the Pope's 'free communication' with all his subjects. A physical impediment to the promulgating of a Bull was, in old times, not more a precaution than is, in our day, the principle that the law of the land is supreme. Just as the physical im-

¹ VII., ix., p. 189.

pediment was unlawful, so is the legislative one; both stay the free course of 'the divine word.' The old dukes, kings, and emperors, knowing that in the popular conscience the law of the Pope ranked above all civil law, put a check upon the promulgation of his Bulls. We say, Promulge what you please, but the law of the land is the only law in the land. 'Here is the ground on which the future battle is to be fought out.'

Just between this article and the catalogue of excommunications came a discussion on unfulfilled prophecy. The Jesuit Father, Soprano, had, by comments on the prophecies of Balaam, Daniel, and the Apocalypse, clearly proved (according to his reviewer) that the city of Rome was destined of God to be in perpetuity the centre of the Catholic Church. The war against the kingdom of Christ was to fail, because 'she' could not lose her empire. But certain points as to the issue of the war now raging between the innovators and the kingdom of Christ, were open to enquiry—'What dynasties will survive, what forms of government will prevail, what end will such and such kingdoms come to? Finally, we may ask whether the Holy City, the mount of God, the capital of the Catholic world, Rome, may *for a time* fall under the power of sinners and parricides, to be outraged by fire and sword, and defaced with crimes.' But, on the other hand, as to Rome being the stable domicile of catholicity, we might doubt of that only if the mount which cannot be moved could be levelled with the ground.

This expositor is true to the old interpretation that the Babylon of the Apocalypse is Rome, but that was the Pagan Rome, which 'fell with the victory of Constantine.' It will be observed that he takes the possibility of a temporary fall of the sacred Rome into the hand of the enemy as but an episode in a war that is to continue through a long series of years.

Since 1870, such forecasts as the above, when uttered, have not the same triumphant tone. Nevertheless, they are now as

clearly expressed as ever. But at the time of which we speak, if the bishops only read what was written for their learning they could not doubt as to the kind of service which was expected of them in the future. Friedrich intimates that they did not read it, when he relates that, in trying to enlighten one of them, he told him that the only way to understand the Council was to study it with the *Civiltá Cattolica* in one's hand. But some of them showed a solicitude that could not be explained on any ground short of a perception of the dangers on which the Pope was running the hierarchy. They evidently did not take the view either of those who thought that the Pope, erected into a vice-God, was about to become the real as well as the titular governor of the world, or the view of those who looked on such dreams as matter to laugh at. The calculations which produced the Crusades and the Thirty Years' War, were dreams; but could the Church afford the indemnity which mankind would exact for the miseries of such another struggle?

The 16th of December marked the second failure in the organisation of the Council. The first was the irremediable one of the absence of Cardinal Reisach, and now, before serious discussion had begun, the third General Congregation had to be postponed from the 16th to the 20th,¹ because nobody could be heard in the hall. So six days passed without a sitting. Debates were actually to take place,—a thing which had neither been desired nor expected. The hall was a good place for spectacle, but a bad place for a parliament. In vain do bishops frown and editors sneer at the writers who said that the Curia had not expected much discussion. Cecconi comes to the support of the 'liars,' as in official indignation they were called who told just what there was to tell (p. 180):—

'It was a deeply-rooted belief of the Directing Congregation that but rarely would anything have to be referred to the committees of the Council, because the Directing Congregation so well knew how profound

¹ *Tagebuch*, p. 27.

Tiec 1869

Confidence that there would be Little Debate. 83

had been the attention given by the Preparatory Commissions, that it seemed extremely difficult to believe that the Drafts so prepared should not be received with general favour by the Fathers.'

This, in fact, is the excuse put forward by the Nine for not having given the bishops a word to say to the Drafts of Decrees before they were confronted with them, as being already in a form to be voted upon. The practice at Trent had been to state the question as a question. Then it was first discussed by the doctors in the presence of the bishops, who after that appointed a small committee of their own number to put resolutions into shape. The Council proceeded to discuss the Drafts so prepared, amending and again amending them, until they were in a form on which (if the subject was doctrine) almost every one could agree.

It was now, however, coolly assumed that so complete had been the work of the secret commissions that the bishops would not raise any difficulties.

'Great variety of opinion,' say the Nine, 'would probably be rare, seeing that the matters to be treated would be already prepared, with great accuracy, by the special Commission, formed by his Holiness, in conjunction with the Directing Congregation.'—*Cecconi*, p. 180.

Cecconi repeats that the great confidence felt in the excellence of the work of the theologians had generated in the majority of the members of the Directing Congregation this conviction. He is candid enough to give the reason for bringing the Drafts ready made into the full assembly, which was to prevent them from being exposed to the influences which a restricted number of prelates might exert. That amounts to saying that the able men whom a free assembly would have chosen to consider and digest its forms of resolution, were not to be allowed any chance of unitedly studying the forms prepared in secret for them. The Court would bring its own plans, with all their details and complex notes, before the full assembly, which could never thoroughly sift them, and in which the majority was assured.

While in almost everything else the rejection of parliamentary forms was commended, as becoming an assembly which had to contend against both the principles and results of parliamentary government, the practice of our own Houses in bringing in Bills ready drawn was pleaded in favour of the course taken in preparing extended drafts of dogmatic decrees. But our Parliament has never yet been called together to vote that laws are as good if issued by the Crown, without the advice of Lords and Commons, as with it. Nor has it ever been asked to pass a measure which neither it nor any succeeding Parliament could recall. Our Parliament is never asked to discuss a Bill without first having the right to say whether it shall or shall not be brought in. It never finds a Bill before it which, if it pleases, it may not refer to a special committee. Any member can move the rejection or the postponement of the whole, can move the omission or amendment of any part, and can take the sense of the House. None of these things could be done at the Vatican Council. The bishops could make Latin speeches in a row, first on the Draft as a whole, and then, in a second row, on the parts. But only twenty-four of their number could ever put a hand to the amending of the proposed statute. With those twenty-four were associated irresponsible persons, non-members. As that mixed body finally shaped the propositions, must the Fathers vote upon them, with a Yea or Nay that sealed the creed of their churches for ever.

It was not wonderful that the Curia should believe in the perfection of the Roman theology, since they took their own government for perfect, and the capital for a model city of the saints. The German estimate of the Court theology is indicated by Quirinus when he says that 'though the Pope had four hundred theologians, theology is now rare, very rare, in Rome.' He goes on to assert that if one should say that ability to read the Greek Testament and the Greek

Fathers in the original was a necessary qualification of a theologian, 'he would be ridiculed.' As to the divinity even of the bishops, the evidence of Quirinus is little more flattering than that of Friedrich; but the discussions yet to come will show that men of real power were not wanting.

The first Scheme or Draft of Decrees on dogma now appeared. It was nothing less than a book of one hundred and forty quarto pages, containing eighteen chapters and fifty-four paragraphs. Frond makes it folio and of 131 pages.

The *Rheinischer Merkur* quotes a Catholic journal which in admiration of this masterpiece says that when adopted by the Council it would form a text-book. Yet this mass of divinity, any phrase, almost any word of which might affect the vital truths of religion, was put before the bishops with only a few days to study it, and they were expected to vote it as an irreformable creed, to be ready for promulgation, as bound on earth and bound in heaven, on the 6th of January, the day decreed in the first session! Friedrich, looking at this bulky pamphlet, cries, All through we have the language of the schools; any one familiar with the Jesuit writings sees at once by whom it has been prepared. No wonder that with this book in hand men having any idea that there is a connection between faith and happiness in this life, or in the life to come, began to be uneasily conscious of belonging to a society the creed of which is from time to time liable to be manipulated in such a fashion. Certainty was laughed out of Court. And uncertainty, which then shivered at the closed doors of the Council, was agitated with questions, not only as to the possibility of a new faith, but as to the possibility of a new Rule of Faith.

Graf W., a Roman prelate, paid Friedrich a visit arrayed in all his vestments and decorations. Surprised at such a display by a stranger, Friedrich asked himself, Does he want to make an impression upon me, or to excite a longing for similar clothes? The conversation turned upon infallibility,

and the Count Monsignore said that it would be carried through; for when the Curia had committed itself to anything, it was not to be balked. Friedrich, saying that for his part he had nothing to do but to speak according to his conscience, and that as a priest he knew well what must be his course when once the point was decided, went on to state that, not having his eye on a canonry or a bishopric, and being happy in his independent position as a professor in the university, he felt free. This surprised the Curialist, but Friedrich in turn was still more surprised when the man in soft raiment and living in kings' houses said that it was otherwise with him. He belonged to the Roman prelacy, and if he meant to continue in it, he must do what he was bid.

The German doctor was struck by hearing people assure him that life was tolerably safe in Rome if you were sure of your cook, your doctor, and your chemist (p. 30).

The German bishops had not, like the French, asked permission to meet among themselves, but their place of meeting had been cared for. Monsignor Nardi, a slashing writer, and a conspicuous member of the Curia, spared no pains to secure them for his own house. Cardinal Hohenlohe offered his for the purpose, but he scarcely received a civil answer. Even German bishops said as much as that they should compromise themselves by being identified with him. They began to feel their position very delicate. The relentless exclusion of all German prelates but the few well-known Ultramontanes from the committees, was but one symptom of disfavour. Friedrich says that Bishop Dinkel had already spoken of the haughtiness of the majority, and most of the German bishops seemed to feel the fetters into which they were put by being deprived of all initiative. As they were assembled on the 22nd of December, with Cardinal Schwarzenberg in the chair, they were joined for the first time by three favourites of the Curia—Senestrey, Martin, and Leonrod. But when Senestrey found that they were discussing the propriety of petitioning the

Pope for a relaxation of the Rules, he remembered that business required his presence elsewhere. We may be ready to smile at men, holding professedly the position of members of a Council, who durst not rise in their places and insist on having liberty to propose what their consciences dictated; and who, when refused that liberty, instead of declining to take part in the mock Council, went into a caucus, and drew up a petition to the autocrat who had snatched away their rights.

But their position was very difficult. If they attempted in their places to speak on the matter, the fatal sentence fell upon them that what the Holy Father had decreed could not be discussed. What then could they do but decline to take part in the Council? This would be coming into direct collision with the Pope. The moral education of their lives had aimed at fixing in their own minds, and they, in their action upon others, had aimed at fixing in their minds, one conviction—that the crime exceeding and comprehending all others was to break with the Pope. They were so placed as to have no alternative but either ‘disobedience’ or the surrender of their individual and collective rights. They seem, indeed, to have thought that it was rather a spirited proceeding to send in a petition.

Archbishop Haynald of Hungary proposed that they should request the Pope to divide the Fathers into eight national groups. This was suggested with some idea of counter-balancing the fictitious majority made up by titular bishops and vicars apostolic. Had one nation been allowed to balance another, the effect no doubt would have been considerable; but how these venerable men could imagine that this scheme had any chance with the Pope, we cannot tell. The bishops *in partibus*, and the missionary bishops, being mostly Italians, would have been well nigh lost in such an arrangement. The Curia well knew that it had been tried at Constance, and was not to be caught.

What Friedrich heard of the opinions of the prelates as to the Draft Decrees, was unfavourable. Cardinal Rauscher was reported to have said that he would allow the paper to be read in his seminaries as the work of a student, but that to propose it to a General Council was too bad (p. 35). Many of the bishops said that its condemnations were untimely, and that it was unworthy of the dignity of a General Council. It was said to be the work of the Jesuit Fathers Schrader and Franzelin; but instead of the latter, Kleutgen was often named. The Dominicans spoke slightlying of it. The Bishop of Ascoli, a Carmelite, said he had only patience to get through half of it, and then he threw it away. Strossmayer said to Friedrich, Why must the Council at this time of day pronounce condemnations as to squabbles heard of only in the schools, and worn out even there? (p. 37). Kagerer told Friedrich that the bishops had agreed not to tell their theologians what passed at their private meetings; on which Friedrich remarks that the bishops were right, for the chaplains and secretaries by whom they were served could not be properly described as theologians. He then gave a sigh for Hefele. Meanwhile, he said, it was hard to listen to the talk of men, like Kagerer, who had come up without preparation, who were not furnished with books, and who drove a trade in theology by guess-work.

Monsignor Nardi's hospitality to the German bishops had not a smooth course. After having met at his house for the greater part of December, when they alighted one night in the Piazza Campitelli, they found the servant of Cardinal Schwarzenberg posted there to send them back again. The Cardinal had received from Nardi a request to be relieved of their further presence, giving so short notice that there was no means of meeting the case but that of setting the servant to turn the bishops away from the door. Thenceforth they found a German host, Cardinal Rauscher.¹

¹ *Tagebuch*, 47.

The General Congregation of December 20th, after learning the names chosen for the Permanent Committee on Faith, had been occupied with the election of the Permanent Committee on Discipline; but as the *Acta* contain no records of any transactions of the Congregations, beyond the bare lists of the committees elected by them, the strictly official means of ascertaining what passed are all but *nil*. The *Acta Sanctæ Sedis* may be fairly considered as official in a looser sense; and it is strange how the brief but clear occasional notes of particulars which they contain, almost invariably confirm the profane writers in statements denied, or apparently denied, at the time by faithful ones. Deputations, including among others Strossmayer, went hither and thither in search of a hall to meet in. Quirinus thought that the one in the Vatican by the Sistine Chapel would not be of good omen, on account of the picture of St. Bartholomew's massacre. Had any real wish existed to find a place in which seven hundred gentlemen might sit and speak, it could easily have been done; but the wholesome exhalations from the tomb of St. Peter would not have been so potent anywhere else, even in Rome, as in the Vatican. One-third of the space in the hall was now curtained off. The debates were to open on December 28th, that is, after twenty days had been lost. Even a fallible, reformable, lay, revolutionary, chaotic, modern-state gathering of heretics like the English House of Commons, properly called the Tower of Babel, might have managed in that space of time to elect three or four committees, even if it had been trusted to agree upon rules of procedure, and to name its own officers.

News of the death of Cardinal Reisach destroyed the hope that his influence might prevent the Germans from standing with the Opposition. The preparations for a code regulating civil and ecclesiastical relations, on which he had spent years, were not to see the light. It had already been resolved not to present to the Council the Drafts prepared by his Commission on Ecclesiastico-Political Affairs. Cecconi (p. 266) thinks that

probably the absence of the Cardinal 'contributed to the shipwreck' of his proposals. The subject was 'thorny'; and again, it was not decorous to make inoperative laws, or expedient to make combative ones. It would seem that the supreme cause of the shipwreck was the practical consideration that now-a-days civil governments, 'which form an essential element in such matters,' oppose ecclesiastical laws, instead of taking charge of their execution. The official historian, however, is of opinion that the failure of this first attempt to indite a code of ecclesiastico-political law is not final. A time, he thinks, may come when it can be renewed, with hope of success,—a declaration full of instruction as to the future. His solemn words sound like a bass, to which frequent utterances of M. Veuillot form a piercing treble. The end of all things, or a reconstruction of the human kingdom, are the only alternatives before us! The time for renewing the attempt to prepare such a code will, according to the Archbishop of Florence,

'arrive when this rapid and ceaseless movement, political and social, going on under our eyes, and making us daily spectators of great and often of unlooked-for events, shall have reached its ultimate period, to which will certainly succeed (unless the last days succeed) an entirely new era in the history of the human species. When that day comes, I know not what portion of the old institutions will remain standing; but sure I am that one of them will have survived, though peradventure externally bruised and lacerated. She alone will be mistress of the field that day, and the princes (if indeed the sound of that name will still be heard), but certainly the nations, having then, after long and cruel experience, made up their minds that out of her there is no well-being, either in this life or beyond the tomb, will demand from her the laws of tranquil repose, together with the earnest of eternal happiness' (p. 301).

This language is the more significant as having been written since the war in 1870, and even since the outbreak in Germany of imperial resistance to the movement for priestly domination. With regard to princes, it seems to breathe the threat which was screeched out by the Jesuit organs in 1869 and 1870, that

if they were not to sink in the coming struggle, they must make peace with the Church.

As to the nations and the laws of the Church, it adroitly represents the nations, not as submitting to receive the law at her dictation, but as demanding from her the laws which give repose. The ever-recurring alternative of submission or disturbance, if not destruction, is smoothly but gravely put. Still, the historian seems as if he wrote thus rather by official duty than by personal impulse. But, like all the 'inspired' writers, he takes it for granted that the Church holds the 'repose' of nations in her power. Cardinals count on the effect of thorns planted in the pillows of statesmen. They know how to teach principles that form a people within the nation ready to obey a foreign word of command, and they know how and when to give the word. They always—so say men in Italy—know how to find an Ahithophel, and how a Delilah!

It is to be regretted that the Drafts prepared by Reisach's commission were left to be shipwrecked at the critical moment. Death had struck down the foremost figure in the 'Council without the bishops,' and the man appointed to take the foremost place in the Council of the bishops. If Reisach's Drafts, which Cecconi clearly intimates were combative, and such as might have proved inoperative, embodied only principles of lowliness and spirituality, and not those of political ambition and reliance on physical force, the publication of them would do more than a large quantity of denunciation in pastorals. But if published, it must be under conditions affording criteria of completeness to satisfy, not Englishmen only, who in such matters are slow to suspect and swift to trust, but Italians, who know with whom they have to deal.

Fears were often expressed lest an attempt should be made on the 28th of December to carry Papal infallibility by acclamation. The bishops, however, seem to have had backbone enough to determine upon a formal protest should this occur. Friedrich tells how those dignitaries who make little of de-

nouncing the laws of their respective countries were very anxious in Rome to find some mode of giving expression to their complaints and desires without printing, which in the Model State they durst not do.

He also states that on the day before the opening of the discussion the Pope was greatly depressed. It may have been a diplomatic depression. What bishop could be so heartless as to make speeches that would weigh on the spirit of the Holy Father, and in fact to call in question Draft Decrees prepared by his authority and proposed in his name? What bishop, by obstructing their adoption, could occasion a risk that the day fixed by Decree for the second session should arrive without any Decree being ready? One of Friedrich's statements, which, before Cecconi published, seemed the most improbable of all, was that Cardinal Bilio, the President of the Preparatory Commission on Dogma, had reckoned on the Draft being carried with scarcely any discussion. Much as we knew of the displacement of the idea of conviction by that of submission, this statement seemed too monstrous. But the Archbishop of Florence appears unconscious of anything strange in the case. If Italian novelists and journalists, with whom the indifference of the national mind to religion is a favourite idea, had combined to give an illustration of that indifference, they could hardly have invented anything so expressive. A Cardinal taking it for granted that seven hundred bishops could hastily adopt for ever as doctrine binding upon themselves, their successors, and their Churches, a considerable work, every single phrase of which any serious man would weigh before he accepted it for his own creed, but would weigh ten times more carefully before he imposed it upon others,—before he took it upon his soul to curse all who did not accept it, and to declare them cut off from the kingdom of God! Yet it is plain that not only Bilio, but the Curia generally, expected the passing of the Draft as almost a matter of course. In their minds the idea of submission to

the Papal authority had first displaced, and then completely replaced, the idea of religious conviction.

The first Vatican Decree passed after the Council had been declared open, fixed the feast of Epiphany (January 6th) as the day of the second session, in the expectation that this Draft, or a portion of it, would by that time have been adopted. But, like the first Vatican appointment, the first Vatican Decree had not been ratified in heaven. On January 6th, instead of the promulgation of any Decree, was to occur an example of history repeating itself, more significant than history has often to record. According to Friedrich, however, Cardinal di Pietro still maintained that the Fathers ought to vote on the Tuesday, for though it might prove desirable to recast the form of the Decree, it was not to be altered in substance. The *Civiltá* said (VII., ix., 227), 'As the discussion on the Draft proposed is not terminated, no Decrees will be published in the second session.' The *Acta Sanctae Sedis* curtly wrote, 'No Decree was published because none was ready.'¹

Meantime the relative attitudes of the Council and of the Catholic governments had become more clearly defined. Following France, and rejecting the view of Bavaria and Portugal, the governments had determined not to interfere. Portugal had sent to her minister his credentials as ambassador to the Council, but finding that he should be alone, Count Lavradio did not present them. France, which for the last ten years had been abused by the Papal organs, was now loudly praised. Even M. Veuillot said that she was more liberal and more Christian than the other nations, for her bayonets were at Civita Vecchia to restrain the violence of the Italians, and God would not forget it to her. True, French statesmen every now and then did show some apprehension as to what might come to pass if every child in France should learn in his catechism that the Pope was infallible, and if most of them should grow up under teachers who would gently show how

¹ V., 323.

the Modern State rebelled against the divine constitution of the world as implied in that fundamental truth, for the government of the nations. It was even said that Darboy plainly declared that should infallibility be proclaimed, the French troops would no longer remain in the Papal States. However that might have been, all that fell from the inspired pens was pervaded with quiet reliance on France. It seemed as if the writers believed that, just then, events depended more on one Spanish lady in the Tuileries, than on all the Frenchmen in Paris and the departments.

It cannot be said that the compliance with the wishes of the Curia shown by politicians, was repaid by a milder attitude on the part of the latter. The new Bull, technically called *Apostoliceæ Sedi*, popularly called the new *In Cœna Domini*, was menacing. The wonderful transformation of the nations constantly being foreseen by the writers of known authority, however mystically expressed, must mean something. The grave *Civiltà* (VII., ix., 134) said :—

‘God is not to be trifled with, and as governments chose to make war directly against Him, lo, almost everywhere are governments down, a reproach of men, and despised of the people. . . . Whom would the people obey? God and the Church, or the State? . . . As it is evident that the Church assembled in Council can only repeat, and that more strongly than ever, that as between God and men, as between the Church and the State, obedience is to be rendered to God and the Church instead of to man and the State, and as it is evident that in Catholic and civilised countries, in spite of all the efforts of sects, respect for the Church endures, and increases, while all respect for States and governments diminishes, it is clear that the Liberals, who are dominant almost everywhere, tremble at the Council, which is bound to proclaim more loudly than ever, We must obey God rather than men.’

Even the little review at the Villa Borghese set M. Veuillot reflecting on the restoration of that ‘Christian order’ which consists in the due submission of the natural to the supernatural order :—

‘If we only think that the Council has to re-establish the Christian order without restoring the ancient aristocracy, irremediably fallen,

and has to replace the social laws in a position where property and liberty shall be freed from the grasp of democracy, which is no more than an administrative aristocracy, we shall conclude that the task is not a trifle, and that the seed to be sown is not of a kind to ripen in a day.'

In most Papal countries, indeed, the ancient aristocracy has fallen, and, much as priests like titles and stars in their train, they like broad acres still better, and legislative power even better still. Even when barons held lands in fief under prince-bishops and abbots, they were frequently tempted to insubordination. And in the Model State, the career open to a lord was as nearly as possible that which in our chaotic state is open to a lady. So, the aristocracy were not to be restored. But in the new Christian order both freedom and property were to be taken out of the hands of the democracy. This had been well done in the States of the Church, and partly done elsewhere, in the middle ages. In the formula, 'The Pope and the People,' people does not, we repeat, mean democracy, but subject populace, with a ruling priesthood and nobody to come between priest and mob. Matters would be greatly simplified if both an aristocracy and an administrative democracy were removed out of the way. But, true to the far-aiming plans of the school, M. Veuillot was thinking of the seed-time, knowing that the harvest was as yet far off. When the prize is no less than the supremacy of the world, a year may well be counted for a day.

M. Veuillot, alluding to those profane creatures the correspondents of worldly newspapers, said he had had to do with government spies, but press spies made him respect the former. The press spies detested respectable men, seeming to think that they spoiled the profession, and prevented it from enjoying all the hatred and contempt it merited (i, 33). M. Veuillot could afford to assume this attitude. The *Univers* was sanctified by the Pope's blessing, and certified by his brief. This high-caste scribe had not, however, said a word about the device by which the election of committees had

been carried, though he gloried in the choice of men. He had not mentioned the electoral tickets, nor alluded to the prohibition of collective meetings of the French bishops, nor to the petition sent in by some of their number for a few morsels of liberty. He had, however, told the faithful that none of the bishops had any desire to be put on the committees, and that a prelate from South America, on finding himself elected, wept and said, 'What do you mean? I am not fit. I know nothing.' Writing on 20th January, after the division of parties had become clearly defined, M. Veuillot said that should an Opposition group be formed, as some feared would be the case, it would only be small, and would be rather outside of the Council than in it. 'Outside, said a bishop to me yesterday, there is some room for the spirit of man; inside there will be no room for anything but the Spirit of God; and though unanimity is by no means necessary, it will nevertheless seldom fail.' It was, at this time, still hoped that the 'pontifical secret' would leave no chink by which the tenor of the debates could leak out. 'How,' exclaims M. Veuillot, 'will this assembly be able to distribute its incalculable labours, and carry them to an end? Immense questions arise on all sides. It is the human species that has to be set in march. Nature feels its infirmity.' Still, it will prove, he asserts, that the Council can more easily make decrees for centuries, than modern governments can make constitutions to last a few months.

One day later M. Veuillot cries (i., 38), 'There is an Opposition list'—he meant for the committees—'who expected to find voting papers offered to each voter on the threshold of a Council, as is done in the polling places where we perform the mysteries of universal suffrage.' He says that the questions had been so well prepared that the men who had to solve them were agreed already (i., 43). We do not know whether he means it as an illustration of this agreement—it seems more like a forecast of the kind of

agreement that was to be—when he tells of one bishop, eminent among the pacific, who said that Ultramontanism had for a long time been the designation of a party, ‘but we shall show that it is the Church. This will facilitate everything, for no one in the Church would refuse to recognise the Church.’ On the eve of the discussion M. Veuillot said (i., 50), ‘The Council will do what the glory of God requires, and the future world will regulate itself according to its Decrees.’

An address to the Holy Father, from the Society of Catholic Italian youth having its head-quarters in Bologna, declared that in answer to the infernal fury of the enemies of the sacred Council, they protested their resolution to obey its Decrees as the holy gospel, as the decrees of God Himself, and to defend its disciplinary acts as the acts of God Himself. In conclusion, they call the Pope, among other titles, the living Peter, the infallible mouth of the Church and of Christ Himself, the Vicar of God, ‘whose word for us and the Catholic universe is the truth of God which endureth for ever.’ A strong force of equally well-trained youths in every country would do something to give substance to the dream of universal empire, by a Crusade of St. Peter.

To say that the *Civiltà* and the *Unità Cattolica* contradicted nearly all the facts reported by the journals of Europe, would be a tame statement of the case. They not only gave the lie, but did so with all sorts of aggravating epithets. The Italian papers were most belied, because they, feeling no respect for the men of the Curia, did not care to put on any, but tore off false covers relentlessly, and even with mockery. According to an ordinary Italian saying, respect for the Curia begins outside the walls of Rome, and increases in proportion to distance. Still, the French, German, and English papers, though more respectful,—the last, in comparison, deferential,—were denounced as lying and lying again. This went smoothly till the lie-givers descended to particulars. Even then it

¹ *Civiltà*, VII, ix, 238.

answered, to some extent, till time brought facts to the test. Now, it is sad to look at these contradictions, and compare them with documents registered in the same pages, or with facts which even there are no longer disputed. Any one who wants a lesson in the art of giving the lie may go to an article in the *Civiltá* (VII., ix., p. 327), and succeeding ones. After studying them an Englishman would be more charitable to Romans when they say that if the Jesuits contradict a thing well, they begin to think it must be true. But he would discover that, under an apparent contradiction, there is often preserved a possibility of saying that there was no real one. A statement has been made containing one main fact, which was perfectly true, but with two or three accidental appendages, some one of which was not true, and the whole is treated as false. For instance, the whole tale of Nardi dismissing the German prelates is to appearance ridiculed, because one journal says that Nardi had made a secret door, at which he played the eavesdropper. Of course it was an Italian journal—*La Nazione*—which thought that a probable action for a monsignore of the Curia.

The *Nuova Antologia*, a review of high standing in Italy, published articles on the Council, which formed the basis of Vitelleschi's book. The *Civiltá* assigned them to Salvatore de Renzi, spoke of them as being not more inaccurate than others, and after general charges came to particulars. The author's 'want of reflection' appeared in his supposing that though abbots and generals of orders both had seats, only the former had votes. Moreover, he had said that in the sessions the Fathers always wore the red pluvial and mitre; whereas in the first two sessions they had worn the white ones, and the statement as to the mitre was *falsissimo*, as false as could be, for in Rome, and in the presence of the Pope, they always wore one of white silk or cloth. When all Catholics were in serious excitement, when they knew that hands were laid on their creed to alter it for them and their

children, it was such matters as the above which weighed upon the minds of the Jesuits, and justified outcry against men who strove to get and give some little information.

The first article of professed intelligence in the *Civiltà* after the Council had really got to work, spoke of giving only the *external* news, which was what all the 'good press' professed to give. What it gave was indeed external. A person turning to these official pages in hope of learning what he would have to believe by-and-by, found paragraphs about 'clothes' (VII., ix., 99). 'We have told our readers of the vestments worn by the Fathers in the public session. They will be pleased to have a translation of the notice appointing the ceremony to be observed in the Congregations,'—the ceremony meaning the ceremonial garments. The men who were undertaking to change for the priests and people the conditions of their membership in the Church, to revolutionise their relations with their neighbours and even with their nations, were yet persuaded that while all this was going on, priests and people must be thinking of how the gowns of the Fates were dyed, and not of what threads they were spinning. So, with conscientious exactness, the faithful were informed that the Most Reverend and Most Eminent Lords the Cardinals would wear the red and violet mozzetta and mantelletta over the rochet; and the Most Reverend Patriarchs the violet mozzetta and rochet, etc., etc., etc.

A touching incident of private life came to soften the feelings of the Fathers on the eve of the struggle. The son of De Maistre, the champion of the pen, and the daughter of Lamoricière, the champion of the sword, had, four months previously, been married. 'Two such fair names,' exclaims M. Veuillot,—yes, two stately figures, bending in vain to stay a falling oak. The young wife was smitten with death, and the widow of the hero could only reach Rome in time to close her daughter's eyes. The whole city united in sorrowing over the mingled tears of the houses of De Maistre and

June 1848

100 *The Pope, the Kings, and the People.*

Lamoricière. Noble Lamoricière! During the four dreadful days of June 1848, in Paris, his chivalrous sword formed a shield behind which thousands sat in safety. None who were of the number, as we were, can ever without gratitude think of him, or of the stainless Cavaignac.

CHAPTER IV.

First open Collisions of Opinion—Pending Debate—Fear of an Acclamation—Rauscher opens—Kenrick—Tizzani—General discontent with the Draft—Vacant Hats—Speaking by Rank—Strossmayer—No permission to read the Reports, even of their own Speeches—Conflicting Views—Petitions to Pope from Bishops—Homage of Science—Theism.

THE moment had come at last when it was to be seen whether the parliamentary proceeding of a discussion, suspended in the Catholic society for three hundred years, was actually to be revived; or whether the bishops, justifying the confidence in their gravity and wisdom which the Curia would fain have cherished, would now set the world an example of magnifying authority, by adopting the all-comprehensive dogma of Papal infallibility by acclamation, without running the risk of any debate. That once done, minor points would settle themselves, whether in the Council or out of it. The fears of a scheme to organise an acclamation were strong, not to say feverish. Cardinal Schwarzenberg wrote, ‘In case a demonstration is attempted for an acclamation, a formal counter demonstration is already provided for.’¹ Before the commencement of the sitting, Cardinal De Luca, now Senior President, gave an assurance that no acclamation would be attempted; adding, however, that he could only give the pledge for that one sitting. Strossmayer, relating this fact the next day, in the house of Cardinal Hohenlohe, added that, should it be attempted hereafter, the bishops of the minority would put in a protest, in

1 *Tagebuch*, p. 44.


the name of Christ, of the Church, of their rights, of their people, and of sound reason.¹

Lord Acton's picture of the scene before the sitting is more distinct than that of the other writers. It is Darboy whom he describes as demanding an assurance that there would be no acclamation. When the promise for the first sitting was coupled with a statement that there could be no guarantee for the future, he said a hundred bishops were resolved, in case that proceeding was resorted to, that they would leave Rome, and 'carry the Council away in their shoes.'²

The uncertainty which had hung over everything but dress was so great that some prelates had prepared their votes, thinking that, owing to the determination to have some Decree ready for promulgation at Epiphany, a division would be pressed on that day.³

In print, the tribune, or desk, prepared for the Council, is a laudable specimen of Roman art. To look at, it is what we must call a common-place pulpit. It was carried from place to place,—more than one writer says, carried all round the hall,—to try to find a spot in which it would be possible for a speaker to be heard. When the desk was at last fixed, two priests, as reporters, took their place in front of it.⁴ Cardinal Rauscher, Archbishop of Vienna, was the first who ascended. Behind him he saw his own achievement—that Concordat by which he had secured for Rome the abolition in Austria of the Josephine Laws. Before him lay the Draft of Decrees, for the most part, as it was believed, the handiwork of Schrader, whom he had himself installed as a professor in the University of Vienna, and who was doubtless a fit man to make it what it was—a dogmatic reflection of the earliest portions of the Syllabus. The sagacity of Rauscher told him that the success of these proposed Decrees would be the doom of the Concordat. Hence,

¹ *Tagebuch*, p. 45.

² *Acton*, p. 73.

³ *Tagebuch*, p. 44.

⁴ *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, v., 316.

he rose, not to support the theology of his nominee, but to save his own diplomatic achievement.

So the discussion opened with a brilliant address, as Friedrich calls it, delivered in the round, rough Latin pronunciation of the Germans. Darboy soon left the hall, saying that it was undignified to sit professedly listening to speeches which one could not make out. What with the mocking of the echoes and what with the pronunciation foreign to all but Germans, none could understand but the few in whose favour combined all the advantages of keen ears, a good position, and some familiarity with German intonation. A certain class of Brahmans will repeat Sanscrit verses just for the learning and sanctity of the thing, without being able to interpret a line. But, though Latin may be, in Rome at least, as holy as Sanscrit, Europeans have imbibed a relish for St. Paul's doctrine, that language is not only for the ear, but also for the understanding. Most Christians would now take it as desirable that, in consultations upon the faith, every word should be understood by every judge who was to give sentence in the final decree.

All that we know of the discourse of Cardinal Rauscher has become known in spite of the silence of every official organ ; and it amounts to no more than the fact that he opposed the Draft Decrees with firmness and ability. The strict Church regime assured by his Concordat to Austria had not been followed by the halcyon days which such a regime was said to guarantee. Loud complaints were made that the moral statistics of Vienna, previously very bad, had, under the new law of marriage, become worse. However that might be, there was no doubt that under the Concordat Austria had undergone both Solferino and Sadowa. If, after all this, new fetters were to be forged, Rauscher was well aware that the chain would snap.

After Cardinals, Archbishops ! So the Irish-Latin of Archbishop Kenrick, of St. Louis, succeeded to the German-Latin of Rauscher. The voice from the Mississippi joined that from the Danube in making light of the theological performance of

Rome. The next who followed was Tizzani, nominally Archbishop of Nisibis, really Chaplain-General of the Papal army. A blind old man, he did not mount the desk, but, speaking from his place, he was the first who gave forth the Latin in the clear, full pronunciation, which must be nearer to the natural one than the others. He said that the Draft was words, words, and nothing but words. Three other Italians followed on the same side. It was still the turn of the Archbishops; and Connolly, of Halifax, Nova Scotia, closed the discussion of the day. There are two versions of his concluding innuendo. One is, that the Draft was to be honourably interred; and the other, that it was not to be amended, but erased. *Cum honore esse sepeliendum . . . non esse reformatum censeo sed delendum.* Fourteen names had been entered, but when seven had spoken, it was one o'clock, and the weary work of attempting to hear was brought to an end. The old men had been already four hours in the hall.

The *Giornale di Roma* and the *Civiltà* gave the names of the speakers, but not a syllable of information as to what they said. The same course was taken by all the 'good press.' It professed to give information only of the exterior of the Council. Even the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, in its Latin veil, does not utter a hint of what view any speaker took. It does, indeed, say that no one replied to observations for, against, or beside the proposals of the Decree, thus confirming the common remark that there was no real debate.¹ Among all the charges of lying, shameless lying, lurid lying, and so on, brought against the lay press, we do not remember any attempt to contradict the particulars circulated as to this day's proceedings, unless indeed it be Cardinal Manning's general treatment of all that had been said respecting an intention to get up an acclamation, as ridiculous rumours.

Cardinal Bilio, as President of the Commission on Dogma, from which the Draft had emanated, would naturally be, as Friedrich says he was, downcast; and we may well believe the

¹ Vol. v., p. 316.

same witness, that the Cardinals generally were disconcerted. On the other hand, Cardinal Schwarzenberg said, ‘It has gone excellently ;’ and Archbishop Scherr, of Munich, thought that it was as if one had heard ‘the rushing of the wings of the Holy Ghost,’—one of the expressions in which that sacred name was often lightly taken during the Council, and which, from hints found elsewhere, seems to have fallen on this occasion also from other lips. Strossmayer was by no means so elated, knowing that the Curia was in a position to hold its own.

This discussion raised the spirits of the minority, and filled them for a while with illusory hopes. It seemed as if the one liberty left, that of making Latin speeches, might turn to great account. Meanwhile, according to Lord Acton, speculation ran on the possible effects of fifteen vacant hats, which were supposed to have the power of doing wonders, and which the genuine Romans would certainly expect to turn episcopal heads in whatever direction they might happen to be held. Darboy said, ‘I have not a cold in the head ; I do not want a hat.’

Quirinus points out the bearing of such multiplication of anathemas as was aimed at in the Draft on the ascendancy of the Jesuits. These anathemas would supply abundant matter for accusation, and so enable the Jesuits to keep men belonging to other orders in constant fear of being charged with heresy. This would tend to make other theologians dependent upon their order. He adds moreover that if the Draft Decrees should be passed, scarcely any professors of Old Testament exegesis would escape the charge of heresy. He makes a quotation from Schrader, as being then ‘a star of the first magnitude’ :—

‘All Papal measures, as regards their truth, belong to the order of faith, or morals, or law. All Decrees, whatever their subject, contain a true doctrine, whether speculative, moral, or juridical. But the Pope is infallible in the order of truth and doctrine, and therefore in all his Decrees.’¹

¹ *Quirinus*, p. 124.

That means, whatever doctrine is contained in each separate Decree, is infallible; and some doctrine is contained in each Decree. Therefore, the element of infallibility enters into every Decree. This language does not carry the conclusion which Protestants often force upon it, that all things contained in the Decree are infallible. But the argument is so put that to the untrained it would easily suggest that interpretation, while it wants but a gentle advance in the premises to make that the logical conclusion. But Protestants are not only habitually, but it would seem obdurately, addicted to a misinterpretation of an opposite kind. If they extend infallibility too far, they confine the meaning of the term 'morals' too much, making a distinction between politics and morals; whereas the Catholic rightly holds politics to be the highest and most momentous affairs included in the realm of morals. Nor is the principle to be lost sight of which the *Cirilitá* laid down in ridiculing the French jurists, that when the Pope has judged a question it is clear that it belongs to the moral order.

Two days later the debate was resumed. The archbishops were still in possession; but after one more of them had spoken came the turn of the bishops. Rank carried it against the rule that in council all are equal. Athanasius the deacon, and Constantine the layman, were both outside the door. And outside the door were also the 'presbyters' who alone at Nicæa represented Rome. Unity had come to mean a sharp separation of the Church into the *Teaching Church* and the *Learning Church*. The *Teaching Church* consisted of the Pope and bishops; the *Learning Church* consisted of priests and people. Such a gulf as neither synagogue nor mosque ever knew separated the ruling few from the submitting and unrepresented many. The odd restriction of the term 'pastor' to bishops, and the amusing interchange constantly taking place between 'pastor' as one name for the bishops, and 'sheep' as the other, is one of the peculiarities which flavour the approved speech. It is assumed that the priests and people are the 'lambs' and

the bishops the 'sheep' in the flock of Peter. But when in the same sentence the bishops appear both as pastors and as sheep, English ideas become confused.

Those who desired to speak entered their names at least one day beforehand ; and of those so entered Cardinals spoke first, Patriarchs next, then Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, and Generals, according to their grade. The members of each separate rank spoke in the order of seniority. It was as if, in our House of Lords, the Princes of the Blood spoke first, Dukes next, then Marquises, Earls, Viscounts, and Barons, in turn ; and as if the junior Duke waited until the seniors had spoken, and so on through all the other ranks. This magnifying of rank at the expense of dignity, resulted in what was not in any proper sense a debate or a discussion, but, as it was frequently called, a set of 'parallel discourses,' in which two lines of remark, that ought to have come into contact, ran regularly apart.

The first bishop who rose was Strossmayer. As he had before attempted to speak upon the Rules, so did he now attack the heading of the Decree, namely, the formula 'Pius IX., with the approbation of the Council,' instead of the Tridentine formula, 'This Sacred Council decrees.' He was called to order by Cardinal De Luca. That point, he ruled, was not to be discussed, for it had been settled in the Rules of Procedure, and also in the form used in the opening session. No one supported Strossmayer in his objection, and, in point of form, the President was doubtless right. The bishops had allowed their birth-right to be taken away, and it was now too late to reclaim it. True, if they had been united, they might have alleged that the taking of it away had been done both violently and stealthily ; but still, it had been done before their eyes.

Strossmayer's speech gave to modern Rome a sensation strange to her, though familiar to ancient Rome,—the feeling caused by the echoes of impassioned reasoning in favour of freedom. And this time it was freedom commended by the voice of a bishop ! The degree of freedom advocated was, indeed,

Dac 1369

Strossmayer and Ginoulhiac.

107

only such as anywhere else would have been a minimum. The reports given of the eloquence of the speaker were exciting, and it would appear that even those of opponents were often laudatory. Lord Acton gives the following passage:—

'What do we gain by condemning what has been already condemned? What end is promoted by proscribing errors which we know to have been already proscribed? The false doctrines of sophists have vanished like ashes before the wind. They have corrupted many, I confess, and infected the spirit of the age. But can we believe that the contagion of corruption would not have taken effect had errors of this sort been smitten down with anathema by Decree? We have no means given to us beyond cries and prayers to God, whereby to defend and conserve the Catholic religion, but those of Catholic science in complete agreement with the faith. The heretics assiduously cultivate science unfriendly to the faith, and therefore true science friendly to it should be cultivated among Catholics, and advanced by every effort. Let us stop the mouth of opponents, who cease not falsely to impute to us that the Catholic Church represses science, and restrains all free thought, so that within her bounds neither science nor any liberty of intellect can flourish or exist. Further, it has to be shown, and that both by words and deeds, that in the Catholic Church there exist true liberty for the nations, true progress, true light, and true prosperity.'

This proposal to fight thought only with thought, and to allow institutions to be tested by their fruits, was well fitted for any soil where the Bible was the statute-book, but was untenable ground in Rome. The excitement was great.

Ketteler embraced Strossmayer as he came down. Senestrey, on the other hand, stated that he had said things for which he must have been called to order in any assembly. Dinkle said he had spoken on his own account, and showed no inclination to share risks with him.

The first French prelate who came to the desk was Ginoulhiac, of Grenoble, who also spoke against the Draft. What he then said we know not. What he had just previously published under his own hand we do know. Resisting the idea of an acclamation, he said:—

'To insist upon dispensing with previous examination, because of the

¹ *Acton*, pp. 74, 75, both in German and Latin.

immense importance of the question, or because the subject of the question was that which in the Church is greatest, would be not merely to depart from the practice of all ages, but it would also be to commit a most serious error, and to awaken in all grave minds just suspicions of the decision which might be arrived at. In past times nothing was so feared as the appearance of not devoting to important decisions sufficient time, and of not giving sufficient satisfaction even to the minds of the prejudiced' (p. 43).

Speaking of the liberty essential to a real Council, he had said (p. 46) :—

' Little does it matter whether the liberty of deliberation and of vote violated in one way or another, whether by fear or by guile, whether the violence exerted is physical or moral ; so soon as liberty is gravely hampered, the Church no longer recognises herself as truly represented.'

Friedrich tells how Strossmayer, the day before, had said that he would write out his speech and send it in; for the reporters were so unskilful that their manuscripts were of little use. But we do not see how he could do more than guess what their reports were. At the same time (it was in the house of Cardinal Hohenlohe), he said that now, since he had been in Rome, he could understand how both the Reformation and the Greek Schism had originated. It was in his view a real crime for the Pope to claim to be the successor of Christ instead of the successor of Peter ; the way in which bishops were driven was, he added, inconceivable, when one remembered that it was they that kept up the dignity of the Pope, and prepared the minds of the people to acknowledge it.

A prelate of different views was he to whom Friedrich had said that, in order to understand the events of the Council, one must read the *Civiltá*, further adding that had he been Prince Hohenlohe in Bavaria, he would have answered the *Civiltá* by expelling the Jesuits from Regensburg. 'They are innocent people,' said the Bishop. 'Individually,' replied the Professor, 'they may be innocent people, but they represent an order which propagates doctrine dangerous to the State.' He tells also how it was found that the French, German, Austro-Hungarian, and American bishops had an International Com-

mittee of three; but that the Pope, regarding this as savouring of Nationalism, and of a revolutionary spirit, forbade it. Lord Acton (p. 52) mentions another prohibition scarcely less significant, namely, that the printed Rules of Procedure of the Council of Trent were, with the utmost strictness, withheld from the members of the Vatican Council. These Rules, and the real minutes of that Council, had at that time never been published, and only saw the light in 1874, by the private efforts of Theiner. Of course, the Decrees and Canons had long been before the world. Among the many denials we do not remember any attempt to deny this specific allegation. An argument could be easily constructed, on the principle now accepted, to prove that it was no interference with liberty to deprive the bishops of the physical possibility of informing themselves of the extent of rights which they had inherited from their predecessors at the latest General Council.

Lord Acton says that one effect of the determination to keep the discussions secret was that it led the bishops to express themselves more strongly than they would have done had they expected their words to be read at home and conned over by Protestants. At the same time, much leaked out. All agree that the inhabitants of Rome took little interest in the discussions, while, in the religious aspect of the question, the Italians generally took scarcely any; and this indifference reacted on the interest they might have taken in its political aspects. They committed the error of despising their enemy. Knowing the men and their communications, they allowed their own estimate of the worth of priests to affect their calculation as to their influence.

There is a well accredited story of Lord Acton going to Florence, full of the burning questions which were to affect the future of every Roman Catholic. Dining with a relation in the very centre of the political circle, and meeting several members of the Cabinet, he naturally expected to find them taking some interest in the cosmopolitan politics then under treatment by

the Senate of Humanity, the Supreme Legislature of the Human Species. But the Italians were buried in some passing question of grist, or the like, and had no ear for the principles which were to shape the future of nations. They saw little in the proceedings more than that the Pundits of an expiring caste were passing resolutions to adjourn the nineteenth century and to conserve the eleventh.

German and English Catholics were not capable of thus treating principles as husks. Whether Fallibilists or Infallibilists, they knew that the destiny of that Society which both agreed to call ‘The Church,’ was now at stake, and that, at least, the repose of nations, if not their destiny, was also implicated. The Liberal Catholics, holding that the attempt to restore a theocracy would only lead to wars, and that humanity would avenge itself on the Papacy for again fomenting bloodshed, hoped that somehow God would save the Church from the blindness of the Curia. The Catholics, on the other hand, equally aiming at *ultimate* peace, and even regaling their imaginations with a vision of millennial repose, so soon as all nations should have accepted the Vicegerent of God as the representative of Christ Himself, were in the meantime profoundly convinced that the only way to obtain that repose was through the very conflict from which their faint-hearted brethren shrank.

The Infallibilists could not harbour the idea of the Church failing in the struggle. That was to them like supposing that the gates of hell should prevail. To the Liberal Catholics the Jesuits were conspiring against humanity and all its franchises. To the Jesuits, on the other hand, the Liberal Catholics seemed to be risking the loss of such an opportunity as might never recur, of putting the Church in a position to constrain governments to accept the principles by which alone nations could be saved. Therefore did they look upon any shrinking from the struggle as indicating worldly fear rather than foreseeing care for the Church. Was a temporary distress to be weighed against the eternal salvation of the souls of entire nations?

2 Jan 1875 Petition of Bishops.

III

Were a few years, or a few decades of years, passed in physical suffering, to be compared with the spiritual joy which would encircle the globe when once the sword of St. Peter had taught all men to recognise the true centre of the species in the reigning and governing Vicar of God? If Liberal Catholics looked upon the Jesuits as conspiring against humanity, the Jesuits looked upon the Liberal Catholics as agitators against divine authority. No wonder that in such a state of feeling, what Lord Acton describes took place, 'The word-war of the hall was always fought over and over again outside, with the addition of anecdotes, epigrams, and inventions.'

It was on Sunday, January 2nd, that two petitions were sent in to the Pope. The first was signed by forty-three prelates, headed by Cardinals Schwarzenberg and Rauscher, and the Primate of Hungary.¹ This was no Bill of Rights, not containing even a challenge of that exercise of prerogative which it sought partially to relax. The privileges for which two princes and forty-one magnates petitioned, 'prostrate at thy feet,' were :—

- (1) That the Fathers might be distributed into, say, six groups, in which Draft Decrees could be considered in the principal living languages before being brought on for discussion in Latin, in the General Congregation.
- (2) That speeches delivered in the General Congregation might be printed for the exclusive use of the members of the Council, and under the same bond of secrecy as that under which the Draft Decrees were communicated to them.
- (3) That the Draft Decrees on faith and discipline might all as soon as possible be laid in a connected form before the Fathers, and should not any longer be presented, as hitherto, piecemeal.
- (4) That the Fathers, after having in the vernacular meetings considered the Draft Decrees, might be allowed to send a couple of delegates from each group to the committee to represent their views.
- (5) That the Fathers might be allowed to print, in addition to speeches delivered in the General Congregation, writings in which questions could be treated more thoroughly; these however to be printed subject to the same bond of secrecy as the Draft Decrees.
- (6) 'Prostrate at thy feet, we crave the apostolic benediction for ourselves and the faithful committed to us.'

We do not know that even the last of the six things here prayed for was granted, for the petition never received an

¹ *Documenta*, i., 247.

answer. These dignitaries clearly state to their royal master the grounds on which they petitioned for some of the elementary rights of human creatures. They say that Decrees cannot be really sifted by speaking a dead language in an assembly of seven hundred persons from all parts of the world, unless, first, in companies speaking living languages, the Fathers have had the opportunity of examining their contents; and that twenty or thirty speaking in the General Congregation, after such a preliminary examination, would throw more light on the proposed Decrees than sixty speaking without any such preparation. And further, that however well acquainted with Latin all might be, there were many prelates who did not speak it. Moreover, the petitioners, admitting that the Council Hall was admirable as being so near the tomb of St. Peter, state that in the first General Congregation, though some of the speakers had excellent voices, not one of them could make himself heard by all. Even since changes had been effected, the greater part of the members could not hear all the speakers. Another of their points is this: Although men well worthy of confidence—*viri fide dignissimi*—had assured them that the reports of the speeches should be distributed to the Fathers in print, so that they might read what they had not been able to hear, ‘in this hope we have been disappointed.’

They appeal thus to their master, ‘Most Blessed Father, by thine excelling wisdom, wilt thou perceive that, as the Fathers can neither hear what is spoken, nor read it, proper consultation is not possible.’¹ They go on to urge that even if the discussions were held in a place where men with the weakest voices could be heard, it would still be desirable that the members should be in a position to look over what had been advanced in successive sittings. ‘Matters of weightiest moment,’ they add, ‘are being treated, and frequently the addition, omission, or change of a single word may adulterate the sense.’ If, say they, the Fathers had the opportunity of explaining their views in writing, they

¹ ‘Consultationem sicut decet haberi non posse.’

could lay many things before their fellow members which could not be brought into speeches. So far as to the opportunity of hearing or reading what was to be said for or against things proposed. As to obtaining an understanding of the proposals, they urged that, in questions of doctrine, one thing so connects itself with another, and discipline is so much affected by doctrine, that they are not in any position to give a judgment on Draft Decrees, obviously forming but part of a scheme, while as yet other parts of it are kept from their knowledge. The relation between the unknown parts and the parts before them is an element in any judgment to be formed.

The second petition, dated on the same Sunday,¹ was signed by twenty-six prelates, including several of those who had signed the other, and a few additional ones, such as Kenrick of St. Louis. Cardinal Rauscher did not sign it, but Cardinal Schwarzenberg did. It set out by indirectly asserting more in principle than the other ; but it ended by asking less in practice. It seemed both to assume the right of proposition on the part of the prelates, and to imply that the taking of it away would deserve blame ; but it had not the courage to say that it had been taken away. Those are not wanting, say the petitioners, who interpret the Rules as not recognising the right of the Fathers to propose in the Council what they may think conducive to the public good, but as conceding it only exceptionally and as a matter of grace. This may be a diplomatic way of indicating what the Rules said without confessing the fact that they did say it. But what they did say was too plain for any such finesse. The prayer of the petition is confined to two points,—that some members of the Commission on Proposals should be elected by the committee, and that the authors of proposals should have access to the committees, and thus have some part in the treatment of the particular matter in which they were interested.

These petitions say more than all the assertions of the much

¹ *Documenta*, ii., 383 ; also Friedberg, 410-414.

contradicted Liberal Catholics about the want of freedom in the Council, and the want of the old spirit of bishops in the men who composed it. According to Friedberg, the first of the two was drawn up by Cardinal Rauscher (xli.). No name of an English, Irish, or Colonial prelate is attached to either petition. Nearly all the names are those of Germans and Hungarians, the only American one being that of Kenrick. His signature proves that the English-speaking group knew of the petitions, and the absence of all other names belonging to that group would seem to indicate that members of the hierarchy from America, the British Isles, and our Colonies did not approve of bishops of their Church being entrusted with such extensive liberties as those for which their brethren petitioned. It is pretty certain that the American archbishop who signed this petition was not one of the prelates who told the Archbishop of Westminster that their Congress was not freer than the Council. Do senators and members of the House prostrate themselves at the feet of the President, petitioning for leave to meet in a place where they can hear and be heard, for leave to read reports of one another's speeches, and for leave to print memoranda,—for leave even to elect a few members of a committee which decides what may and what may not be recommended to the President, to be proposed should he approve of it? If they do not, we must only believe that America sends some citizens to Europe whose information as to the institutions of their country is not to be relied upon. Did Ginoulhiac, whose observations on the necessity of perfect freedom in a Council we have lately seen, consider legislators free who had to petition for such things? Outside of the number of Cardinals resident in Rome, could even a Cardinal have been found beforehand to assert that liberty would not be gravely hampered, in any legislative assembly, whenever those who were called legislators were compelled to indite petitions such as we have described? We doubt if even a resident Cardinal would beforehand have dared in terms to deny that when, in a professed Council, liberty is

gravely hampered, the Church does not recognise herself as represented. Now, it is easy to turn the point of all such arguments. Peter the Infallible has only to say what rights James and John, Thomas and Paul shall enjoy, and in exercising them they possess all the freedom that God has been pleased to grant to them.

The allusion in the petition to the ease with which the sense of a speech may be altered seems like a remark of Strossmayer, quoted by Friedrich, that reports which were under no check but that of the Curia, and which even the speakers themselves were not allowed to inspect, could not be of any use. To this Friedrich adds, How much would the weight of the remark have been increased after an incident on July the 9th, 'when the majority of the Council, and a committee of the Council, did not scruple formally to deceive the minority.'

The prayer of the petitioners for a sight of the whole scheme, as prepared, before they should be called upon to erect part of it into irreformable Decrees, was doubtless caused in part by the obvious relation between the Drafts already brought to light and the Syllabus. That compendium was not mentioned any more than it had been in many other public instruments, but the first Draft fitted to its first sections, just as the Encyclical which accompanied its issue had done to the whole document. Notwithstanding its authority, its form made it of doubtful interpretation, and these Decrees aimed at giving statutory form to its sentences. An *Index Schematum*, or List of Drafts, had come to light,¹ which let the bishops see that what had hitherto been produced was but the first instalment of projected legislation covering all the ground occupied by the Syllabus. The first Draft treated only the philosophical and theological portion of the subjects; but how were the principles enunciated to be applied, when the sections on Church and State should be arrived at? The somewhat obscure teaching in the Draft on the elevation of man into the supernatural order, would, to mere politicians, look like theological nebulae, and, to mere

¹ Friedberg, xlv.; Coccooni, 483-489; and Frond, vii., p. 263.

theologians, like ill-digested divinity. To men versed in the esoteric dialect, it was clearly intended to prepare the way for the doctrine of the elevation of man by baptism above the control of civil law, in all that affects his loyalty to the supernatural order of the Church, whose Decrees had, by that regeneration, become his supreme statutes, her courts his supreme tribunals, and her priests his supreme magistrates. It was the dogmatising of the principle which has already passed under our eye, that in baptism the subjects of the civil power are changed. Another principle now habitually underlies that one, namely, that man by redemption through Christ is raised above the government of the natural order, and placed under that of Christ, through His Vicar. The studious among the Liberal Catholics knew that under the name of Naturalism their principles were condemned.

On the Monday following the day of the petitions, when the Congregation opened, after the prayers had been read, Cardinal De Luca rang the bell, and solemnly addressed the Fathers. Here, for once, we are able to give the very words that sounded in that hall of concealment, and this time not from an unofficial publication of official documents. It is the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis* that now actually give us a speech. But it is a speech about the dead. The Cardinal is not so confident as to their happiness as were the writers of the Crusaders of St. Peter respecting that of those who fell in the Crusade. But he presents the two forms of the Papal worship of and for the dead, which differs from both the Chinese and the Brahminical. We see the two sides of it—the patronage of the living by the dead, and the patronage of the dead by the living. The Cardinal said :—

‘ MOST REVEREND FATHERS,—It is known to you that since the opening of the Ecumenical Vatican Council four Fathers have passed away by a death precious in the sight of the Lord, namely, the Most Eminent Charles Augustus de Reisach, Bishop of the Sabina and First President of the General Congregations; the Most Eminent Francis Pentini, Deacon of St. Mary in Portico; the Most Reverend Anthony Manastrski, Bishop of Przemyśl of the Latin rite; and the Most Reverend Bernardin

Frascolla, Bishop of Foggia. The Christian virtues and the shining merits towards the holy Church of God and this Apostolic See, where-with they were most largely adorned, inspire us with a sure and pleasant hope that their souls already enjoy rest eternal in the embrace of the Lord, and that in the presence of God they patronise our labours by their intercession. Since, however, human frailty is such that they may even now stand in need of our suffrages, let us not neglect earnestly to commend them to the divine mercy.'

After this De Luca announced that in place of Reisach had been appointed Cardinal De Angelis. Thus one who, just before the Council opened, knew, or professed to know, so little that he told Cardinal Hohenlohe that nothing was to be done beyond condemning the principles of 1789, but who had served the Curia by the device of an election ticket, took the first seat, in which elevation the Opposition saw the reward of service in the elections. Next was announced the appointment by the Pope of Cardinal Bilio as President of the Committee on Faith, and that of Cardinal Caterini as President of the Committee on Discipline. The committees were not allowed to choose their own chairmen, nor yet was the Council allowed to name the chairmen of its committees.¹ The next day, after Mass had been celebrated by Archbishop Manning, again had Cardinal De Luca to announce a death. It was that of the Bishop of Panama, a Dominican. The statement as to his sufferings here is plain. But as to his happiness hereafter, the full confidence felt in the case of the Crusaders, and the qualified confidence felt in the case of the two Cardinals, and of the two bishops whose deaths were reported with that of Cardinals, are both wanting. We have not here the 'in peace' which in Rome, before priests learned to make a commerce of the dead, the poorest Christian wrote, it might be in the roughest scrawl, over the head of his wife or child; nor have we here the life and immortality whereof the light makes the happy believer 'rejoice for a brother deceased.' Eduardo Vasques was not a Crusader, and was not a Cardinal, and had not even the happiness of being reported

¹ *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, v., 317-318.

dead in company with a Cardinal. He was but a bishop, and, without doubt, in the pains of purgatory; so De Luca just said that he had died last night, after great suffering, borne with exemplary patience. ‘Proper mortuary services will, as soon as possible, be performed. In the meantime, let us commend him to the mercy of God, both by the sacrifice of the Mass, and by other works of Christian charity.’¹

The day before the second session, a procession moved to the Vatican, of seventeen carriages, carrying seventeen deputations, each bearing an address, with signatures, in a richly bound volume, for presentation to the Holy Father. These addresses conveyed that homage of science to the Pontiff the appeal for which has been already mentioned. *The cultivators of science at the feet of Pius IX.*, and, *The cultivators of science at the throne of the Holy Father*, were the titles of articles in Catholic journals. The way was led by the deputation from the pontifical academy of the Immaculate, which had initiated this movement.

They were received in the Throne Room. A long address to the Pontiff was read. He sat, unmoved, to hear it. Then, ‘he lifted his eyes to heaven with an ineffable expression,’ and uttered a prayer that the sentiments conveyed in the address might spread among the multitudes of scientific men whose false science was ruining society. The Pope would quote Scripture, as he often tries to do; and his text was *Captivantes intellectum vestrum in obsequium fidei*—Taking your intellect captive to the obedience of the faith. Probably he was thinking of 2 Corinthians x. 5, ‘Bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ,’ where the Vulgate translates, ‘Every thought (*vόνμα*), every intellect.’ He then assured them that pride was the sin of the day, and that it was all a repetition of the original ‘*I will not serve*,’—alluding to Satan’s ‘Better reign in hell than serve in heaven.’ Cold men of science hearing this language from him who was striving to put all human honours,

¹ *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, v., 319.

titles, and powers below his own, might think that some scientific test of his humility would not be amiss. The Pope rose, the *savans* knelt down, and he gave them the benediction.

Having then resumed his seat on the Throne, ‘Here I am,’ he said, familiarly; ‘here I am, to receive your gifts.’ There was a scientific test of their professions! The President of the Academy of the Immaculate advanced, presented his volume containing the address and signatures, and with it an elegant purse full of gold. The head of the next deputation followed, presented his volume and his purse of gold, and so on, until the seventeen had completed their offering. The Pope had a pleasant word for each. Then saying, ‘God grant that your example may be followed by many,’ he closed the audience.¹ How different was it now from what it was when ‘science was the echo of the Pontiff,’ or even from what it was when Galileo had to face the Inquisition, and to argue with Bellarmine!² At the latter moment, the two revolted tongues, German and English, with their smaller kinsmen, Dutch, Danish, and Swedish, were unknown in the schools. Their libraries were yet to be. They had but lately received into them the source of their literary life—the Bible. But into them had the Bible come, not lapped in the languor of the cloister, but instinct with the life of a great revival. Still, it was under the ban of the western Brahman and of his self-styled sacred tongue, the Latin. The polished old languages, those of the Italian, the Castilian, and the Gaul, those which inherited the Roman wealth and culture, were all in the service of the Papacy alone.

Except a few northern schools, which had made themselves a name in the strife of the Reformation, all seats of learning on the Continent were on the side of the Pope. Now, how changed! Out of his own Model State, where were the universities canonically instituted? They had ceased to be. Meantime, the

¹ *Civiltà*, VII., ix., 358-9.

² Valuable light has lately been thrown on the two trials of Galileo by Dr. Reusch, of Bonn; and Signor Berti, ex-Minister of Instruction in Italy, has published the original record of the trial. The last I have not seen.

nations which at the Reformation were but emerging out of barbarism, had become learned in all the learning of the ancients and moderns. The two revolted tongues, German and English, had filled the world with a literature such as the Latin, even when Augurs and Pontiffs were called Cicero and Aurelius, had never known. The Portuguese, which had at one time promised to be the *lingua franca* of all the ports from Morocco to Japan, had given place, first, largely to the Dutch, then universally to the English. The Spanish and French, which had promised to divide between them North and South America, were sundered, and were both overshadowed by a dominating growth of English. That north-western tongue, cradled amid stern winds, was found by the Reformation as the rude but hardy dialect of some six or seven unlettered millions. Now it had become the wealthy and flexible, the noble and all-expressing speech of at least eighty millions. Thirty millions in Europe, with between forty and fifty millions in America, called it, with a common family pride and a common family joy, their mother-tongue. In Australasia, a future Europe promised to call it her mother-tongue. In India it was teaching the pundit, in China the mandarin, in Japan the daimio, in Africa the Kaffir chief, the Negro freedman, and the merchant of the Nile. That single language had now more schools and colleges, more laboratories and institutes of research, more books and journals, more patronage and discussion of Art, than all the Papal languages put together. And as to the German, if the lack of equal liberty had reined the people in, while the effects of the Thirty Years' War, joined to those of the chronic splitting up into small States, had prevented their growth and expansion in a similar measure, they had, nevertheless, with huge and patient power, piled up a Titanic literature, and in many a movement in the higher march of intellect their banner led the van. Men of the Catholic schools of Germany so felt their own superiority to the science and literature of actual Rome, that the strokes of their contempt not unfrequently fell

4/11/

even on the reputed sages of the Curia, sometimes laid on in a fashion more scholastic than scholarly.

In the General Congregation of January the 4th, the Curia had the satisfaction of hearing, not only a diocesan bishop, but a German one, defend the Draft.¹ It was Bishop Martin, of Paderborn, to whose eminent qualities official writers bear loud testimony, though in the eyes of the Liberal Catholics he does not seem to be a prodigy. He blamed the manner in which the bishops had treated a document proposed by the Pontiff, which ought to have been handled with reverence, and rebuked such language as 'to be erased.' He desired the adoption of the Syllabus just as it stood. As the way to bring back the stray sheep to the Holy Father, he enjoined the recognition of his infallibility, which would reclaim Protestants. Both the expectation of Martin and Manning that the new dogma would facilitate the conversion of Protestants, and that of all the Ultramontane leaders that it would hasten the submission of governments to the Lord Paramount of the world, lose part of their marvellousness when we find bishops like Bonjean proclaiming it as of great importance for the conversion of Hindus. Bishop David, of St. Brieuc, alluding to Martin's warning, said if he must not say that the Draft was to be erased, he would say that if it was dead let it rise again; but some bishop must breathe new life into it. Friedrich says that Cardinal Bilio was particularly hurt by this speech.

Bernardou, Archbishop of Sens, read a speech for Audu, the Patriarch of Babylon. The Chaldean solemnly pleaded against the levelling proceedings of Rome, maintained the ancient immunities of his Church, and ventured to throw out a warning against innovations, lest the Orientals should be altogether alienated. He afterwards received a message to repair to the Vatican, and to come unattended. About seven o'clock on that January night, the man of seventy-eight passed the Swiss guards, in their stripes and slashes of yellow, black, and red,

¹ *Tagebuch*, p. 68.

with their halberds and their helmets, and while lonely pacing the corridors, had time to remember how the house of the Inquisition stood over the way, and how utterly he was in the power of the King of the Vatican. It will be some time before what befell him comes to light.

Theiner, the celebrated Prefect of the Vatican Archives, had been long engaged, as was universally known, in preparing for publication the *Acta* of the Council of Trent. He had been arrested in this project. This was attributed to the instigation of the Jesuits. On the 4th January Friedrich went to Theiner to beg permission to consult the *Acta* of Trent. 'Theiner told me that he was now forbidden to let any one even see the *Acta*. All I could obtain from him was this—he showed me the piles of the copied documents in the distance' (p. 65). There is a picture for the days of an Ecumenical Council!¹ The day following, another German on the banks of the Spree was busy with the Council. To Bismarck the state of things so far was chaotic. 'I should not think it wise,' he says to Arnim, 'for us to intermeddle in this misty chaos, where we do not yet see clearly enough to choose the right basis of operations.' He sees that Rome may make aggressions, but rests in proud repose in the power of the nation to throw her back within her proper bounds, and in the confidence that an attempt on her part to alter her relations with the State without its consent will not eventually turn to the disadvantage of

¹ This tale of Friedrich may form a pendant to one of Theiner's own. He relates how, in seeking for Tridentine documents which ought to have been in the Vatican, but were not, and some of which were in the library of Lord Guildford, he proposed to make a journey all the way to England. His brother oratorian, Dr. Newman, applied to Lord Guildford requesting that Theiner might have access to them. This was refused. That nobleman could not see why the Prefect of the Vatican Archives should come so far to examine documents of which there must be abundance there! Poor Theiner had found poverty, not abundance. There had been removal, as well as concealment. His ill success in England did not prevent him from saying that the honour of first publishing the minutes of Paleotti was due to the Rev. Joseph Mendham, an Anglican presbyter,—'which, certainly, is not to our honour or glory' (Vol. I, p. vi., vii.).

the government. The continuance of peaceful relations is greatly to be desired, but it is not for the government to attempt to give a direction to the events of the Council. It can only cherish sympathy with the efforts of the German bishops, and, if they desire it, give them its support. Bismarck expressly declines to support by any diplomatic step the proposal for vote by nations. Such a step would involve a serious recognition of the pretensions of the Curia. We must, he says, hold ourselves aloof from the Council, and free to bring its conclusions to the bar of our laws. He, therefore, does not deem it wise to attempt a permanent united meeting of diplomats, with a view to influence the Council. All that can be done is to encourage the German bishops, and to assure them that their rights will be maintained in their own country. But they must be made fully to understand that serious changes in the organisation of the Church would compel the government to alter its relation to her, both in legislation and in administration.¹ Had Bismarck known all the plans of the five preceding years, and all the events that were to follow, it is doubtful if he could have taken a better course. And had his main object been to live at peace with Rome, and not merely to do the wisest thing for Germany, he could hardly have guarded more jealously against undue or premature interference.

CHAPTER V.

The Second Public Session—Swearing a Creed never before known in a General Council—Really an Oath including Feudal Obedience.

THE same tone of disappointment in which the *Civiltá* had said that as the discussion of the Draft was not concluded, no Decree would be promulgated in the second session, pervaded the additional remark that the world would describe as a vain

¹ *Cologne Gazette*, April 1st, 1874.

ceremony the recital of the creed with which it had been resolved to fill up the day. Writers of different shades, as if by concert, did describe it as a religious ceremony,—a mere ceremony, an empty ceremony, a vain ceremony, and a tedious ceremony. The *Acta Sanctæ Sedi*s said that though no Decree was promulgated the session was of great importance, because of the singular profession of faith. The worthy Monsignor Guérin was happiest in his description, for, misplacing the account of the great opening procession, he put it in to enliven the dull day a month later (p. 103). Vitelleschi, with his Roman eye, was not impressed, rather chilled, by the appearance of the Fathers, all in uniform white, according to the rubric of the day, with big numerals on their stalls, looking as if they were labelled.

Orthodox writers laboriously prove how the victory of the Church is the faith, and at that particular moment the faith of the Church of Rome was the creed of Pope Pius IV. Sambin calls the session a religious ceremony, in which the Church appeared in all her greatness, fully prepared for the struggles about to arise ; which language reminds us that in preaching the Crusade the text, ‘This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith,’ is frequently quoted in a martial sense. Guérin tells how one bishop, after taking his oath, on returning to his place, knelt and repeated the Benedictus ; for, adds the historian, he ‘did not expect ever again to see anything so nearly representing the magnificence of heaven.’ Bishop Allou, of Meaux, fainted and was carried out, but the brave old man on recovering insisted on being brought back into the hall, where, supported by two bishops, he went up and gave in his oath.

So far from taking this session as a vain show, we take it for one of the most distinctive footmarks left in the deposits of history, by the mammoth which we call the Papacy. Without contrivance of man—in contravention, indeed, of arrangements made with patient forethought—the Vatican Council was com-

elled, under guise of reciting a creed, to exhibit its bishops as if barons swearing allegiance to a prince in peril of losing his estates. The creed recited was one never before seen or heard of in any General Council. An apparent accident set the faith of the early Church, and the modern composite oath and creed, before the eye of history in a contrast sharper than any artist could have devised.

A cause similar to that which led to this day being employed in setting face to face the old creed and the new, had at Trent led to the act that formed the reverse of the medal. That act was the setting up of a historical monument to the identity of the creed 'before Luther' with the ancient one. At Trent, as we have before said, the question was whether the Church should be reformed or the creed conformed. The Bible demanded the former course, the Papacy the later ; and the Papacy thrust the Bible into the pile of traditions. At Trent, on the day fixed for the third session, no Decree was ready for promulgation, just as none was ready at the Vatican on that fixed for the second.

Consequently, at Trent, after much reluctance, the Fathers, rather than let the day appointed pass without a session, consented to fill up the time in doing what many of them felt would expose them to ridicule—in reciting the creed. Thus did they create an example which the Curia now followed. Two unforeseen accidents, linked together only by the association of precedent, led to the placing of the Catholic creed as it existed up to the Council of Trent, and the Romish creed as framed after Trent, side by side in a framework so impressive as to insure the exhibition of the two in contrast to all ages.

At Trent the Fathers said that they would set forth as the firm and sole foundation, against which the gates of hell should not prevail, the creed used by the Roman Church, which was the *principium*, wherein 'all who confessed Christ' of necessity concurred,—an expression which seems as if it was the last breath of catholicity on the lips of the Papal society.

Another slight reminiscence of catholicity appears when it is said that the creed is given in the exact words in which it is read ‘in all churches,’—a terminology proper to apostolic pens, or to the lips of our glorified Lord, speaking to His servant John, when the word ‘churches’ was the Christian vernacular, and ‘church’ as a collective was rarely used, and only in the very largest sense possible; never minified to mean a priestly caste, much less an upper order in that caste, least of all the priests of one city, not to speak of the inconceivable limitation to the chief priest whom they had set up.

Two of the expressions employed at Trent are worthy of a moment’s notice. When the bishops said that the creed which they were about to recite was the one *used by* the Roman Church, history for the time got the better of municipal pride. They might have employed the ambiguous expression ‘the creed of the Roman Church;’ but, following ancient ways, they forgot that resource. The language they did use is not that which would have arisen out of the facts had the Roman Church framed the creed and communicated it to other Churches. It was not a creed she framed, but one she used. Again, they profess that this creed is given in the precise words, *totidem verbis*, in which it is read in all Churches. Does that mean that the Greek Churches, which do not use the words ‘and from the Son,’ are unchurched? If it does not mean that, the words are loose; if it does mean it, the terms, while excluding the schismatics of the East, include the heretics of the West, who received that clause.

Led by a way which they knew not, the Fathers at Trent set up a memorial of the faith of the Christian Churches as they found it in the creed. Led also by a way which they knew not, the Fathers at the Vatican set up an everlasting remembrance of what their predecessors at Trent had done with the faith. As builders, when about to set up a structure of wood on a foundation of stone, lay heavy timbers betwixt the two to form a new foundation for the new material, so did the-

Fathers at Trent. Their foundation for the new material was 'apostolic and ecclesiastical tradition;' itself a timber so soft that any joiner could mortise in props of like nature to support even hay and stubble. Yet this material can by builders' art be made to look fair, till the sweeping flame shall wrap it round, and 'the day shall declare it.'

The Cardinals arrived on the morning of the Epiphany, dressed in red; but they changed to the white proper to the day. Patriarchs, primates, archbishops, bishops, abbots, and generals of orders, were all in white, except the Orientals, who had never surrendered to the primacy of Rome on the sacred subject of vestments. The Pope entered the hall, as he had done at the first session, between Antonelli and Mertel.

After Mass, Dominicis-Tosti and Philip Ralli, the two Promoters of the Council, reverently drew nigh to the throne, and addressing the Pontiff, said:—

'Inasmuch as, by ancient appointment of the Fathers, the sacred Councils of the Church have been wont to set the Confession of the Faith in the forefront of all their doings, as a buckler against every heresy, we, therefore, the Promoters of this Vatican Council, do humbly pray that profession of the Catholic faith in the form prescribed by thy predecessor of sacred memory, Pius IV., be made, this day, in public session by all the Fathers of this Vatican Council.'

The Pontiff replied, 'We enjoin and command accordingly.'

Then arose the sovereign from his throne, took off the sacred mitre, and, with loud and clear voice, recited for the first time in the history of man, as the belief of a General Council, the creed of Pius IV. Near the end of it, he came to the clause which swears obedience to the Roman Pontiff. This he omitted. The conclusion swears to maintain the faith just recited, and, as much as in the confessor lies, to enforce it 'on all those committed to him.' The Pope simply said to enforce it 'upon all,' and then he closed according to the regular form,—'I, Pius, promise, vow, and swear, so help me God, and these God's Holy Gospels.'

Bishop Fessler, Secretary of the Council, and Bishop

Valenziani, now came to the throne. The Pontiff handed to them the creed of Pius IV., just as he had handed his own Decrees at the first session. Valenziani, ascending the pulpit, recited it, in his own name and in that of all the Fathers. When he came to the portentous obedience clause, omitted by him who owes no account to man, tribunal, or nation, the bishop read, 'To the Roman Pontiff, successor of the blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ, I promise and swear true obedience,'—as if it was an installation in a feudal order. No wonder that Canon Pelletier, writing in *Frond* (vol. vii., p. 170), should say that this act of homage, 'in the circumstances of which all are aware, had an immense importance.' Valenziani then concluded the form as the Pope had done, only, instead of enforcing obedience 'upon all,' it was 'on all committed to him.'

Patrizi, the Senior Cardinal present,¹ now rose, came to the throne, knelt, laid his hand on the volume of the Gospels, and lifting up his voice, said, 'I, Constantine, Bishop of Porto and Rufina, promise, vow, and swear according to the form now read, so help me God, and these God's Holy Gospels;' and he kissed the book.

Then Cardinals and Patriarchs, one by one, after them Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, and Generals of Orders, in regular gradation of rank, first two and two, and, later, four and four,² came successively to the throne, and during the space of two hours, knelt down, laid the hand on the book, repeated the above words, each inserting his own name, kissed the book, and so swore allegiance to the King of the Vatican, under the form of a profession of the simple and loving faith of Christ. The two creeds, recited at Trent and in St. Peter's, are below, in parallel columns—the one representing what the Council of Trent found, and the other representing what it left.

¹ The Dean of the Sacred College, Cardinal Mattei, was unable to attend the sittings.

² *Acta Sanctae Sedis.*

Future epochs will have to mark subsequent innovations. We put *the clause forming the basis of the new dogmas* in italics. The other italics are those given in Dr. Challoner's recension¹ :—

THE CATHOLIC CREED BEFORE
THE REFORMATION.

'I, N., with a firm faith, believe and profess all and every one of the things which are contained in that creed which the holy Roman Church maketh use of ; namely—

'I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible : and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, *born of the Father before all ages*: God of God ; Light of light ; true God of true God ; begotten, not made ; consubstantial to the Father, by whom all things were made ; who, for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man. Was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate ; He suffered and was buried, and the third day He rose again, according to the Scriptures ; He ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father, and is to come again with glory to judge the living and the dead ; of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Life-giver, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who together with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified, who spoke by the Pro-

THE ROMISH CREED AFTER THE
REFORMATION.

'I, N., with a firm faith, believe and profess all and every one of the things which are contained in that creed which the holy Roman Church maketh use of ; namely—

'I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible : and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, *born of the Father before all ages*: God of God ; Light of light ; true God of true God ; begotten, not made ; consubstantial to the Father, by whom all things were made ; who, for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man. Was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate ; He suffered and was buried, and the third day He rose again, according to the Scriptures ; He ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father, and is to come again with glory to judge the living and the dead ; of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Life-giver, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who together with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified, who spoke by the Prophets ; and I)

¹ *The Grounds of the Catholic Faith*, p. 3. The obedience clause in Challoner, not being meant for the clergy, does not contain the word *swear*. For the same reason is the final clause, which implies authority, omitted. The translation of that clause given here is from Mr. Butler's version.

phets; and (I believe) one holy catholic and apostolic Church, I confess one baptism for the remission of sins, and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

believe) one holy catholic and apostolic Church, I confess one baptism for the remission of sins, and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

'I most steadfastly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.'

'I also admit the holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our holy Mother, the Church, has held, and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.'

'I also profess that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one; to wit, baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony; and that they confer grace; and that of these, baptism, confirmation, and orders cannot be reiterated without sacrilege.'

'I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid sacraments.'

'I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent, concerning original sin and justification.'

'I profess, likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for

the living and the dead. And that in the most holy sacrament of the *eucharist* there is *truly, really, and substantially*, the *body and blood*, together with the *soul and divinity*, of our Lord Jesus Christ ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood ; which conversion the *Catholic Church* calls *transubstantiation*.

‘I confess, also, that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament.

‘I constantly hold that there is a *purgatory*, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

‘Likewise, that the *saints* reigning together with Christ are to be honoured and invocated, and that they offer prayers to God for us ; and that their *relics* are to be held in veneration.

‘I most firmly assert that the *images* of Christ, and of the Mother of God, ever Virgin, and also of the other saints, are to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration are to be given to them.

‘I also affirm that the power of *indulgences* was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to *Christian* people.

‘I acknowledge the holy catholic and apostolical Roman Church, *The Mother and Mistress of all Churches*; *And I Promise [and Swear] True Obedience to the Bishop of Rome*, successor to St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

‘I likewise undoubtedly receive

and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent. And I condemn, reject, and anathematise all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church has condemned, rejected, and anathematised.

'This true Catholic faith, *Out of Which None Can Be Saved*, which I now freely profess, and truly hold, I, N., promise, vow, and swear most constantly to hold and profess the same whole and entire, with God's assistance, to the end of my life; and to procure, as far as lies in my power, that the same shall be held, taught, and preached by all who are under me, or are entrusted to my care by virtue of my office. So help me God and these *Holy Gospels* of God.'

Among the seven hundred men who repeated this set of propositions, unknown to Holy Scripture, we may feel assured that there were not wanting some who as they approached the end of the old, thought, That was the faith as it was professed before Luther; and as they entered upon the new, thought, Where was this religion before Luther?

What a contrast between the old and the new! If ever it was true, it is here true, that the old is better. Under the old creed, the conscience is not hampered by any question about the authority of traditions, either apostolic so-called, or such as were confessedly ecclesiastical. The conscience is not perplexed with a fear of interpreting Holy Scripture differently from the unanimous opinion of the Fathers. It is not weighted with seven sacraments, not contracted with scruples about mere rites and modes of administration, not burdened by having to take for gospel every word which some past Council has said on

some specified doctrine; not bewildered by a professed repetition oftentimes of the sacrifice once offered up for ever, full, perfect, and sufficient; not materialised by transubstantiation of the substance of the bread and wine, not mystified by taking half a sacrament for a whole one, and by asserting that the deliberate evasion of Christ's sacramental command was a true performance of it; not secularised by the mercantile reckonings of purgatory; not let down from filial Christianity towards servile polytheism by the worship of saints, relics, and images; not demoralised by the traffic in indulgences; not narrowed by the domination of one municipal Church over all others; not cramped and degraded by identification with the sins and follies of one human head, much less by an allegiance to that head, as a lord of the faith and a sovereign of the conscience; not envenomed by anathematising all who do not accept every article that we ourselves accept.

By a necessary, logical process, included in what is technically called diminishing the extension of a term in proportion as we increase its intension, it comes to pass, and must always come to pass, that whenever a Church adds to the conditions of membership, she curtails her catholicity. Trent diminished the comprehensiveness of the Papal Society by many new and some grotesque conditions. The present Pontiff has added others, and so far has the shrinking process been now carried that a *reductio ad absurdum* cannot be logically far off. Believing too much, which comes of believing too little, ends in believing nothing. All these successive submissions of conscience to 'authority,' of scriptural enquiry and private judgment to priestly dictation, end in the paralysis of the believing faculty. They render a man capable of nothing but submitting.

The ordinary oath of the Papal bishops has often been shown to be in substance the oath of a feudal vassal to his liege lord. It has but a flavour of any evangelical office or work of the soul-winning ministry of Christ. It is essentially the vow that binds the baron as feudatory of a spiritual state to the crown

on which his State depends. The Emperor Joseph II. clearly saw that any man bound to the Pope by that oath could not be reckoned as the subject of any other prince, except by one of those generous fictions which on behalf of the Pope, by way of exception, governments have admitted. But even that oath was not enough; the confession of faith in God must, for all the clergy, be turned into an oath of loyalty to the Bishop of Rome—an oath to a human head in a creed!

The process of taking the oath lasted, as we have said, two hours. The crowd was not great. The session did not raise enthusiasm in any one. The reverence of the people was not more than is commonly shown on great occasions in St. Peter's. They usually form what Friedrich calls a gaping, chatting, promenading crowd; and what Vitelleschi pictures as a striking mixture of the sacred and the profane. Friedrich, who viewed the act of homage from the gallery for theologians, said that nothing could be more tedious. He did not feel flattered with his company in that gallery. Formerly, only doctors were known at Councils as theologians, and, as we have seen, they had real work to do. Now, he says, the chaplains and secretaries of bishops, and even the men who carry the red caps of the Cardinals, figure as theologians—‘an edifying company.’ Even the *Stimmen* had only a few sentences for this session; and the *Civiltá*, though read principally by persons who may be supposed to have already seen the creed of Pius IV., filled up room by printing it at full. Quirinus wondered whether this ‘profusion of superfluous oaths was reconcilable with the scriptural prohibition of needless oaths.’ They had seven hundred and forty-seven oaths taken.

Only the genius of M. Veuillot sufficed, so far as we remember, to cheer the gloom of the day. It was the Epiphany, and in the portions of Scripture included in the offices of the day, he saw the interpretation of the ceremony. The royally robed potentates who bowed before the enthroned priest-king were *the kings of the Gentiles* prostrating themselves and

worshipping the Church, presenting their gold, and frankincense, and myrrh. The words of Isaiah, 'The nations shall come to Thy light, and the kings to the brightness of Thy rising,' had the same grand meaning. So he cries (i., 79) :—

'Behold St. Peter's ! The throne of the Pontiff and the Cardinal at the altar, and between throne and altar eight hundred bishops ! Behold the prophecy and behold the fact !'

This might be the right idea of the new world to which the Council was the door, but to bring forth a world with these as its kings, not in prophecy, but in possession, would cost some terrible throes. 'The equestrian statue of Constantine,' proceeds M. Veuillot, guiding the right ideas in the direction of right facts :—

'The equestrian statue of Constantine in the portico of the Vatican seems lighted up by these prophetic words. Another, and a greater, Constantine will be sculptured in this place, and a called people, a marching people, which in its turn will proceed to the ends of the earth, till there shall be no more idols, slavery, or night.'

M. Veuillot remarks that in the galleries were present diplomatists and princes who had fallen ; but the Church abides ! In the crowd, he says, was an Italian 'revolutionist, Signor Minghetti, once a subject and minister of the Pope. He bowed with propriety under the benediction of his Father and his master, who was betrayed by him ; but he abides !' The fallen princes represented those who, having supported the Papacy, both temporal and spiritual, had been brought to ruin by its bad teaching and worse example. Signor Minghetti and his bow represented those who, rejecting the temporal Papacy, wished to conserve at least the show of the spiritual Papacy. It is for future time to tell whether they to whom he will bequeath the tangled undertaking, will take their place with ex-kings, ex-dukes, ex-princes, and so forth, in the gallery of failures, or whether they will take their place among the wise men who, rejecting the spiritual as worse than the temporal Papacy, and risking all to found States on the principles of the Word of God, have built up great and happy realms. Italy

does not think a principle worth running any risk for. She thinks it practical to say to the Papacy, We have found thee unfaithful in the unrighteous mammon, and therefore do we take it from thee, but we commit to thy trust the true riches.

The *Acta Sanctæ Sedis* say that no date was fixed for the next session. The confidence in the readiness of the Fathers to swallow a large pamphlet of creed in a few days was shaken. ‘No one,’ it is pensively added, ‘could foresee when Decrees would be in readiness, because many Fathers might probably be lengthy in their discourses.’¹ The learned editor seems as if he would fain emulate the flight of M. Veuillot, but he soars with weighted wing. In a long apostrophe to Rome, he styles Pius IX. ‘the captain who gloriously fills the place of thine ancient Cæsars.’² In one of his speeches made to Roman professors, Pius IX. calls himself ‘the Cæsar who now addresses you,’³ and to whom alone are obedience and fidelity due;’ and to this his editor appends a note saying, ‘By what a wonderfully just comparison does the Pope apply the figure of a Cæsar to himself, on account of his temporal principality.’ When Pius IX. says that to him alone is obedience due, he must be taken to mean, in Rome; for his doctrine is not that no obedience is due to temporal rulers, but that in things purely temporal it is due to them, excepting always when their authority and that of the ecclesiastical magistrate come into conflict.

It is evident that the Curia left this session under the damping effects of a disappointment. It is also evident that some of the bishops felt that they had now performed two sessions, with a month between them, and that the only distinct impression left upon the mind was that they had been twice exhibited, before the whole world, at the feet of a man more richly robed than themselves, seated on a throne in the house

¹ *Acta S. S.*, v., 327.

² ‘Sub eo duce qui locum veterum tuorum Cæsarum gloriose occupat.’—*Ibid.*, 324.

³ *Discorsi*, i., p. 255.

of God, and calling himself Father of kings and princes, and Governor of the world. Canon Pelletier points out the great advantage which the Church had obtained by having the Creed of Pius IV. ‘consecrated’ in a General Council.

CHAPTER VI.

Speech of the Pope against the Opposition—Future Policy set before France—Count Ar nim's Views—Resumed Debate—Haynald—A New Mortal Sin—Count Daru and French Policy—Address calling for the New Dogma—Counter Petitions against the Principle as well as the Opportuneness.

ON the Sunday following this disappointing session, the Pope received fifteen hundred persons in a public audience. Even the language of M. Veuillot does not exaggerate the effect of his speech upon that occasion. ‘What he said on the Council will loudly resound through the Catholic universe.’ What he said cut the bishops of the Opposition, and Liberal Catholics generally, to the heart. We quote from the version of M. Veuillot :—

‘Would-be wise men would have us treat certain questions charily, and not march against the ideas of the age, but I say that we must speak the truth, in order to establish liberty. We must never fear to proclaim the truth or to condemn error. I want to be free, and want the truth to be free. Pray then, weep, force the Holy Spirit, by your supplications, to support and enlighten the Fathers of the Council, that the truth may triumph and error may be condemned.’

After his first version of the speech, M. Veuillot said that a word had been ‘unfortunately omitted.’ The Pope had said that those who opposed certain measures were

‘blind leaders of the blind. Well, if the leaders want not to lead any but the blind, and cannot see their game, the Church, preserving her own liberty, will know how to win without them or against them, the game which they obstinately set themselves to lose’ (i., pp. 86 and 100).

This was treated, not as a mere gust of temper, but as a calculated appeal through the press to the clergy, and to the

devout generally, against the bishops of the Opposition. Yet the longing of the Pope for his liberty was natural. He had always believed himself to be infallible. The Jesuits told him that the full recognition of that attribute, and the free use of it, were the only remedies for the misfortunes of the Papacy, and for the troubles of mankind. He read in the *Civiltá* how all nations were at this moment looking to him as the one saviour, capable of lifting them out of the Slough of Despond into which the Reformation first and the Revolution next had plunged them. He heard of faithful bishops, learned authors, able journalists, one after another, intimating in prophetic strains an era of glory to follow the recognition of his rights. All asked, how could the world do otherwise than stumble and fall so long as the divinely appointed guide was not recognised? All asserted that nothing could prevent the world from rising up, healed and created anew, when the Vicar of God, acknowledged by the Church, in the plenitude of his authority, should speak the word, Let there be light, at which chaos would flee away, and when he should follow it up with the supreme word to kings and nations alike, which all must learn to obey. Heretics would resist, but the faithful, under the banner of the Vicar of God, would certainly prevail. Nothing stood in the way of all this blessing and glory but a few bishops.

These bishops were represented as being partly calculating men, unwilling to get into trouble with their governments; partly cowards, who actually feared that the standard of his Holiness might fall in the struggle. Some were represented as jealous priests, paltering about the little prerogatives of their Sees, instead of merging all in the glories of the Holy See. If, in a matter so great, the Pope chafed at delay caused by such inconsiderable men, it was not more than might be expected from human nature so incensed, and so persuaded, even in the case of one less vehemently suspected of vanity and self-will than is Pius IX. He said that some thought that the Council was to set everything to rights, and some that it would ac-

complish nothing. ‘I am but a poor man, a poor feeble man, but I am Pope, Vicar of Jesus Christ, and head of the Catholic Church, and I have assembled the Council, which will do its work.’¹

M. Veuillot also was becoming a little impatient. He apparently wanted to see the beginning of the ‘clearing away’ of which he had spoken in 1867. He could make hay even when the rain fell.

‘I find a connection between the long, heavy, gloomy, grey, tedious rain, and the political temperature of Europe. Journals, speeches, professions of faith, statesmen, ministers, evolutions, revolutions ;—what a rain !’

The following passage, tracing out the policy that might save the Second Empire, is a specimen of skilled writing, clear to his clerical readers, dim to heedless Parisians ; but capable of interpretation by a politician who would ask himself, not what his own sense of such language would be, but what was the sense of M. Veuillot.

The new minister (Ollivier) must accept this program :—

‘To break with the Gallican, revolutionary, and Cæsarian prejudice (which are all one) by frankly recognising the liberty of the Church ; to assure all liberty by and through the assertion of this liberty, as mother and mistress ; to prepare the accessions necessary to the honour and the conservation of peace ; to permit men to be made against this perpetual plague of revolution which exudes only courtiers of the mob, or courtiers of Cæsar ; this is the grand game he has to play. In the interest of the Emperor and the dynasty, I wish he may win it. Alas ! during the last twenty years the game has been lost, more than once, by the fault of the chief player ! But Providence is pleased to be obstinate, and to leave the game open, with favourable cards in the same hands (vol. i., p. 98).

In the gloaming of these January evenings, two men might be seen walking somewhere between the Ripetta and the Via Condotti, and the tall figure of one of them was that of Count Harry von Arnim. A letter which he on one such occasion

¹ ‘A French prelate, commenting upon the text of this discourse, sneered at the simpletons who allowed themselves to be led by a one-eyed man (*un borgne*). It is well known that the Bishop of Orleans has lost an eye by study.’—*Ce Qui se Passe au Concile*, quoting the *Moniteur* of March 24th.

handed to the other was published, in 1874, by the *Presse*, of Vienna,¹ and bore the date of the day before the impatient speech of the Pope. To whom the letter was addressed is not stated. Alluding to the petition of the bishops, Count Arnim says: 'You see they are modest, and organisation is as defective as courage.' He feels the want of practical tact in the bishops. If they had meant to succeed in their opposition, they ought to have impugned the composition of the Council, and the Rules imposed upon it. Had they first of all rent the net which the Vatican and the Gesù [the Jesuit establishment] had cast over the wise but timid heads of the bishops, infallibility would have fallen through the meshes. The Count is not sure that the Curia will persevere with the dogma of infallibility; and does not see of what advantage it would be to them, when they can at any time call a Council and prescribe to it how and what it is to speak. Some of the Fathers feel as if they were in some sort the Pope's prisoners since they have entered on the course into which they had been drawn on. They had allowed themselves to be led so far in a certain direction during the last twenty years, that it was only when they saw that it was to be turned to earnest, that they began to ask how they could make black white at home, and how the Catholic people would take it. That was the feeling that produced 'Fulda.' People belonging to the Curia say that the bishops need a couple of months in the air of Rome to inspire them with the grand conceptions of the place; and after that all will be of one mind. He cannot understand how the German Catholics are going to let five hundred Italians, and among them three hundred boarders of the Pope, dictate laws to them in spite of their own bishops. Under the pretence of Catholicity, exclusive Romish-Italian formulæ are imposed on the Catholic mind of all nations.

¹ We quote from the *Cologne Gazette*, April 4th, 1874, which, quoting the *Presse*, says, 'The Count will remember the walks in the gloaming, and another by the baths of Diocletian, and so will be able to tell where the letters come from.'

If Rome resented the obstinacy of the provincials, some of the provincials began to open their eyes at what they found in Rome. Friedrich quotes one well acquainted with the Curia, whose words may be matched out of Liverani. ‘The Cardinals,’ said this authority, ‘are red-stockinged . . . not fit, with the exception of four or five, to be curates in a village church.’ Friedrich himself had begun to think that their principal function was ‘parading.’ But at that Court did not everything depend upon parading? Many of the Cardinals might be no better men than the tongue of Rome (not a scrupulous one) made them, and no greater theologians than Liverani and Friedrich said that they were, but some of them assuredly had great abilities, and all had shown themselves to be blessed with the faculty of getting on, which is generally some qualification for ruling. Disgusted by the low appearance of the monks and their mendicity, Friedrich yet confessed that, in present circumstances, such swarms of them had an advantage, as keeping a certain sort of population out of mischief. How different the view of M. Veuillot! To him the monks were the ideal of Christ’s benefit to mankind. Free from the world, from the care even of a name or a tomb, the world ‘must allow their crushing sandals to pass over the poisons which its pride has sown’ (i., p. 223). It remains to be seen whether the plants springing from seeds that thickly fall from a free Bible, a free soul, a free pulpit, and a free press, will die crushed as poison plants under the sandals of the monk, or whether they will yet flourish like grass of the earth, and the fruit of them shall shake like Lebanon, when *fakir* and monk shall together be remembered among the things that fatally decay in the shade of a growth which, though at first the least of herbs, becomes afterwards the greatest of all trees.

In the street Friedrich met Graf A., doubtless one who then proudly filled a proud post, but who now unhappily lies under a heavy cloud. The Count told him that a petition in favour of bringing forward the question of infallibility, drawn up in

Manning's sense, was already signed by five hundred bishops. Another of Friedrich's touches is, that *Janus* always lay on Darboy's table, and Hergenröther's *Anti-Janus* on that of Ketteler. After calling the latter work very dishonest, he says, 'The upshot of this book is, that the Pope alone is invested with divine authority, and before this Baal of the Jesuits, the majority of the Council means to bow the knee. Will not that amount to decreeing the death of the Church? She may lay herself down crying, "Jesuits, you have conquered me." As a specimen of what bishops even in Council assembled had come to, he quotes the memorable words of Hergenröther, '*The bishops have nothing to do but to set the conciliar seal to a work which the Jesuit Schrader has prepared.*'

'Happy bishops,' cries the poor theologian, himself tormented by opinions, and unable to let others believe for him. 'Happy bishops! you may give dinners, see works of art, take your siestas, parade in pluvial and mitre, for the Jesuit Father has taken care of all the rest; and, then, setting to the conciliar seal is not hard work! There is nothing to do but to say *Placet*, and all is over.' Much depended on the interpretation men gave to their oath. Canon Pelletier (*Frond*, vii., p. 170) says, not unnaturally, that at the moment when the Fathers prostrated themselves at the feet of the Pope, the majority was formed. All who understood 'obey' in the sense of the Court, would vote what the Pope told them to vote. But Ginoulhiac, of Grenoble, soon to be Primate of France, had taken care, beforehand, to protest against such an interpretation. Though expressing some fear in citing it, he did cite the language of Bellarmine, to the effect that so free must a Council be that the bishops, their oath notwithstanding, must not only say what they think, but must even proceed against the Pope should he be convicted of heresy.¹ Such language, in the mouth of Bellarmine, as contrasted with that of Des-

¹ *Le Concile, etc.*, par Mgr. L'Evêque de Grenoble. Paris, 1869.

champs, Manning, and the other zealots of infallibility, marks the progress made by the Papal claims in our day.

The General Congregations were resumed on the 8th of January, when two new Drafts on discipline were distributed. The Congregation of the 10th was remarkable for striking speeches, and for an unforeseen turn of the debate. Haynald, Archbishop of Colocza, replied to the few who had defended the Draft, especially to Martin, and Räss of Strasburg. He charged them with having attempted to deprive the Fathers even of the liberty left to them by the Rules, for they had reproached them for discussing what was laid before them. Did not even the formula at the head of the Decree, for speaking on which Strossmayer had been called to order, say, 'the Council approving?' which surely implied that it was open to it to disapprove. Martin had said, We shall say 'It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us;' But, rejoined Haynald, though Martin may know that we are to say so, *we* do not know it. This speech was described as one of remarkable power, second in that respect only to the speech of Strossmayer. Cardinal Capalti, one of the Presidents, listened with outstretched neck, and both hands behind his ears; but so skilfully was the discourse constructed, that Haynald escaped being called to order. He was often applauded, especially at the conclusion. It is said that Cardinal Bilio, who was responsible for the Draft, being, for a Cardinal, strong in German, knew three words of it,—*Deutsche* (German), and *freie Wissenschaft* (free science). He leaned back, often repeating, with an inward shudder, *Deutsche, freie Wissenschaft*.

Bishop Maignan, of Chalons, who followed Haynald, did not mount the pulpit, but stood before the Presidents. His speech was also spoken of as having been very striking. He attacked the Draft, especially its phraseology. What, he asked, was meant by *anima est forma corporis* (the soul is the form of the body)? The Greek Bishop of Grosswardein defended the Draft, saying that at first he had doubts, but that the more

he studied it the more he was satisfied. As he had previously said, in the meeting of German and Hungarian prelates, 'I do not like many dogmas,'¹ when he next appeared among them some one said, 'Greek faith is no faith,' and he appeared among them no more. A Chaldean prelate, Kajat, speaking with a fine, clear voice, said, 'It was scarcely becoming for a General Council to be occupied with matters so local as the opinions of this or that German professor ;' and repeated the unwelcome words, 'Free science,' as Haynald and Maignan had done. The debate now seemed as if it might prove very searching. The minority had strong, if ill grounded, hopes, but a new proof of the way in which the Rules played with deliberation was now sprung upon them. If a free assembly can close a discussion when it deems it already ample, it can also continue it so long as the conscience of its members cries out for a hearing. After the speech of the Bishop of Grosswardein, up rose the President, and said that, in pursuance of power given in the Rules, of withdrawing a Draft Decree when disputed, the Draft should now be withdrawn from the Council, and should be remitted to the Committee, to be moulded by it. What! could not the Council go on with its investigation? Had it not control over a proposition once laid before it? No; the Twenty-four, with the theologians of the Court, were now in sole possession of the proposed measure!

Had the Council been free to form itself into a committee, or to select one from among its own members after this discussion, doubtless some of the men who had shown that they were capable of sifting the clauses would have been put upon the committee, beside the few who had defended the Draft. But that was the very danger which the Nine had foreseen, and against which they had provided by a permanent committee, elected before the

¹ How strong this language was considered in Rome may be judged from what the *Cirilità* said of the Minister of Public Instruction, Signor Bonghi:— 'In the sitting of May 14th, 1873, Bonghi, then a private member, dared to say, blaspheming like a true son of Lucifer, "The Catholic Church has multiplied her dogmas too much "' (IX., ix., 242).

question was argued. This provision was effective for its end, reducing the part left to the bishops to that of making Latin speeches in rows, according to rank and seniority. One other liberty they had—the momentous one of saying Ay or No. Had not the Council been weighted with creatures of the Court, that single liberty might have sufficed to stay the great organic change necessary to the scheme of reconstruction. We do not know whether the sitting we have just described¹ is the one of which Quirinus stated that Cardinal Antonelli withdrew from it much disgusted, saying to a diplomatist that if the Council went on so it would never have done.

While, therefore, the Curia, disgusted with the bishops, had seen their perfect work torn to pieces day by day, now the bishops, astounded at the Curia, saw the future creed shut up in secret even from them! In its absence, they began on the 14th to discuss discipline. That was a notable day. It witnessed the creation of a new mortal sin. The *Acta* do not contain the document by which this was done.² In Councils that were really general, a Christian bishop would have considered it a duty to tell his clergy and people what he said, and what he heard others say, about the faith of Christ. But on this day, Pope Pius IX. turned this sacred duty of a bishop into a mortal sin. Secrecy, the genius of the Papacy, and publicity, the child of light, now closed for a life and death grapple. Any man of that assembly who should hereafter tell out of it what passed within it was to be guilty of mortal sin. The oath imposed before the opening upon the officers, and the injunctions of secrecy upon the bishops, had not availed. The step taken by the Pope was a loud acknowledgment that truth had leaked out. In a surly way this is admitted by the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*. Shameless journals—*effrontes ephemerides*—had reported, as having been spoken and done in the Council, things partly true and

¹ We have taken the outline of this sitting from the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, and in the filling up we have principally followed Friedrich.

² The Freiburg edition does, p. 162; also *Guerin*, p. 113; *Friedberg*, p. 461; and the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, v., p. 337.

partly false. ‘This had probably arisen from some one or other, who lightly held the *pontifical secret*, having given information, so taking upon himself to ignore the dignity of the Apostolic See in treating ecclesiastical questions.’¹ Vitelleschi, Roman as he is, asks,—If the Council is a supreme assembly, who is entitled to impose this penalty of mortal sin? Men of the Curia, accustomed to the making of innocent acts into sins, and of sins into licensed actions, would not scruple to read such a document in the face of such an assembly. Such is their state of conscience, that, far from feeling any shame, probably they would enjoy the idea of the shame and confusion of conscience which they were inflicting on the bishops. But men brought up in England and America could sit there, while this new yoke was fastened upon them, and say not a word! The bishops were really to be pitied. They were entangled in the creed. Their oath had shut them in, and so Pharaoh caught them. Had they not sworn *true obedience* to the Roman Pontiff? and had not he commanded secrecy? and did he not now say that they could not break that command without incurring the guilt of mortal sin—*sine gravis culpae reatu*? There is no hint of a protest having been raised by any one. To speak of these gentlemen in one aspect as citizens of free nations, and in another aspect as prefects of the Pope, is scarcely any longer accurate. It is but by a fiction of the frailest sort that men so tied and bound by the chain of a foreign potentate can be called citizens. We have seen that the *Civiltá* holds it as beneath their dignity as ambassadors to be citizens elsewhere than in Rome. Still, professing to be citizens, they were to be pitied. And if they were to be pitied, still more was human society to be pitied that had to bear the influence of seven hundred masters of a multitude whose consciences had come to such a pass. ‘A bishop,’ says Quirinus ‘who should show a theologian, whose advice he wanted, a passage from the *schema* under discussion, or who should repeat

¹ V., p. 337.

an expression used in one of the speeches, incurs everlasting damnation. . . . A Papal theologian whom I questioned on the subject, appealed simply to the statement of Boniface VIII., that the Pope holds all rights in the shrine of his breast' (p. 164).

Count Daru, who now appears on the political stage in Paris, afforded some entertainment to Don Margotti, who is to Italy what M. Veuillot is to France, the leading Papal journalist, having, according to a saying of the *Français*, more power than all the bishops. According to Quirinus, the redoubtable pair are 'the two modern Fathers.' Count Daru said, on January 11th, that 'our national maxims in matters of religion, the independence of the civil power, and liberty of conscience, cannot be menaced.' This was child's play to Don Margotti. In his view, France needed the new Pope-Suzerain almost as much as Italy needed the restoration of the old Pope-King. Don Margotti¹ contends that the doctrine of modern parliaments is that they are themselves infallible. This he proves by a text from Emile Ollivier. That oracle on one occasion had said 'We are justice!' but Don Margotti prefers an infallible Pope to an infallible people. Menabrea, Sella Minghetti, and such as they in Italy, according to him, represented God, the State. Margotti, therefore, looks on the *mot* of Ollivier as

'providential, for it proves the necessity of an infallible Pope. The world absolutely needs a permanent and infallible authority; if the authority is not the Pope, up starts Ollivier, and ascribes it to himself. It is time that infallibility should be defined, that we may have no more such absurdities as Ollivier proclaiming "We are justice!" Oh, let the dogmatic definition of infallibility speedily sound from the heights of the Vatican, and free us from modern justice, which calls itself now Baroche, now Ollivier!'

Freeing us from modern justice and from M. Emile Ollivier are two different matters, though it is natural for Don Margotti to hail as providential an opportunity of treating them as one.

¹ *Unità Cattolica*, January 16th.

The fact that he looked on the forthcoming constitution of the Church as a means of getting rid of both modern justice and of M. Emile Ollivier, is some gauge of the extent of powers which the initiated took to be contained in the re-constructed Papal monarchy. The assumption of infallibility by parliaments is rather a favourite notion of Jesuit writers. They seem to mean that any authority which will not acknowledge its subordination to the Vicar of God must claim to be itself infallible. Yet, we might deem our own Parliament wiser than the Pope and his Curia, and morally superior, and still not think them anything more than erring mortals, with infallibility some way off. An English member of Parliament, repeating the Jesuit oracles, says that our Parliament claims to be infallible.¹ It would seem that no assertion of the Jesuits is too ridiculous to be seriously repeated by their Oxford converts, though many are kept back, but for other reasons than their absurdity. The decree in which the Parliament does declare its acts irreformable would be a great curiosity. So would even such an expression as the following, quoted by Don Margotti (January 18th) from the archbishops and bishops of the province of Vercelli:—

‘Most Blessed Father, now and always shall we be found, in obedience and reverence to your Holiness, approving, and disapproving, whatever you, from your apostolic chair, do approve and disapprove; from which chair Jesus Christ Himself speaks in the Holy Spirit to the bishops and people of the whole world.’

The meeting of the Italian Parliament having been postponed, to give time to a new ministry to prepare measures, Don Margotti, viewing the paralysis of the Parliament as a moral effect of the presence of the Council, said (January 22nd):—

‘The word of Rome imposes silence at Florence, and the Council of the Vatican does just as our Lord once did when He closed the mouth of the Sadducees. Gentlemen, you have talked enough. Now stand still, and hear the great word of God. Your day is past, the day of the powers of darkness; and now the days of the Lord will dawn, the days of truth and light.’

¹ *Contemporary Review*, Feb., 1876.

The Address in favour of a definition of the dogma of infallibility had now become the talk of all. Vitelleschi (p. 85) states that it was carried round by the Archbishop of Westminster, and the Fathers of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, as the Jesuits are called who form the editorial college of the great magazine. A letter, inviting adhesions, and signed by several bishops, chiefly belonging to the class who had not any national ties, was circulated with the Address. The signatures to that document itself were headed by the names of Manning, Spalding of Baltimore, and Senestrey. What had been felt from the first was now openly declared on all hands, although the utterance of it had often been charged as a great sin upon the Liberal Catholics. We mean, that the object of the Council was the definition of Papal infallibility, and that all the rest was manœuvring. Brief as are the historical notes in the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis* they state that we may almost say that the whole Council was convened for the sake of the fourth session.¹ It is evident that this does not mean that only the one measure was aimed at, but that all the other proposed legislation, really voluminous, would only have led up to this, and that, the great point having been carried, all the others were virtually carried also. Vitelleschi notes the fact that the citations given in the Address to prove that earlier Councils had propounded Papal infallibility, were not apposite. Quirinus says that the Address 'bristles with falsehood.' Veuillot, on the other hand, finds its arguments cogent,—indeed, unanswerable. Vitelleschi remarks that the writers speak with indifference or contempt of schisms which might arise from the measures they demanded. Friedrich calls it a compound of untruth and slander. Veuillot urges that the contradictions to the doctrine had now reached such a head as rendered its definition absolutely necessary. Yet all this contradiction had arisen since the personal organ of the Pope gave the signal for an acclamation.

¹ Vol. vi., p. 3: 'Cujus causa quasi dices concilium ipsum, tanta episcoporum frequentia, fuisse convocatum.'

That liberty of the Church which existed nowhere else upon this sinful earth, except in Ecuador, did exist in Rome; and, therefore, all other liberties were secured; that is, the liberty of doing everything not forbidden by divine authority. But printing in Rome, except by licence, was forbidden by the authority that never can be in contradiction to evangelical law. The Address for making that authority into an infallible one was, however, circulated in print, without *imprimatur* of any sort. This sign was understood on all hands. It was not to be mistaken. The divine authority asked for signatures. The canvass for them was keen.

Vitelleschi relates that the promoters of the Address were charged with dragging a question forward prematurely, which, in the natural course of things, would have come on for discussion when the prerogatives of the See of Rome should be considered. To defend themselves, they said that the step they had taken was sanctioned by the Cardinal Presidents. This 'indiscretion,' he proceeds to say, 'exposed the Roman Curia to the reproach of itself begging for its own apotheosis, devoid of feelings of the simplest propriety.' Even the clergy, he thinks, were disconcerted at this proceeding, except the Jesuits. These were urged on by a fatality to proclaim 'the infallibility of Clement XIV., who abolished them, and that of Pius IX., who had almost done so too, while they must find a formula to interpret the judgment of the next Pope who shall abolish them once more.'

This Roman noble accounts for the strange vehemence of Manning on the ground that he had been a Protestant:—

'He had seen his own religion from within, and not from without; and had seen the Catholic religion from without, and not from within. In Protestantism he had seen only the infinite internal divisions and subdivisions; and in Catholicism he had admired only the magnificent effect of its unity. He had not appreciated the good results produced by the former, through moderate liberty and the constant exercise of private reason and conscience; and he had not felt the dangers which, in the latter, flow from excessive authority. He is enamoured of authority, as much as the slave is of liberty. This want of equilibrium, and of a just Catholic feeling in his dealings respecting the Council, was charged

against him, even by the most faithful and devoted of the clergy in Rome' (p. 89; Eng. ver., 60).

A counter Address was sent in from German and Hungarian prelates; one from French, one from Italians, one from Americans, and one from Orientals. But these, not being in the interest of the Court, could not be printed without a licence, and could not hope to obtain one. Even Cardinal Rauscher had failed to obtain leave to print a short treatise on the Papal infallibility in Latin, and had to send it to Vienna.¹ So the Opposition had to dispense with type. Then, what were they to do with their Address, when complete? The course of their opponents was clear—they had only to send in theirs to the Commission on Proposals; and some, in their bitterness, said that that Commission had been formed for no other purpose than that of receiving and forwarding it. But these Opposition addresses did not propose anything to be done, but simply requested the Pope not to have a certain thing proposed. The bishops had no power to move in the House that the subject should not be considered, or to move that it should be deferred till the meeting of the next General Council. Care had been taken that they should not have 'the negative right of proposition' any more than the positive. Then, what could they do? Nothing whatever, but what they had done already, namely, petition the Pope. Their former petition, indeed, had received no answer. Still, that was a request for the recalling of a *fait accompli*, or, at least, for its modification. This, on the other hand, was only a request that a thing suggested should not be done. 'Can any more singular relative position be imagined,' says Vitelleschi,² 'than that of a man who receives a number of people into his house, with a design of proclaiming his apotheosis, and at the same time receives from them a pressing supplication to renounce that honour?'

None of these various Addresses stated that the signers

¹ *Tagebuch*, p. 108.

² P. 91; Eng. ver., 61.

opposed the new dogma only on the ground of opportuneness. This ought to be carefully noted. The opposite is now almost always either asserted or assumed; but the documents have not perished.¹ Such a position was skilfully avoided. It is quite true that the only grounds, formally stated in all the Addresses *but one*, are grounds which might be concurred in by men who objected to making the opinion of Papal infallibility into a dogma, though they did not object to it as an opinion. But the German Address was clearly distinguished from the others. It plainly and forcibly demurred to the principle, though couching its objections in terms of great courtesy. After alluding to questions of opportuneness, the German and Hungarian bishops proceed:—

‘We cannot pass in silence over the fact that other grave difficulties exist, arising out of the *dicta* and the acts of the Fathers of the Church, out of genuine historical documents, and out of Catholic doctrine itself, which, unless they can be entirely removed, it would be impossible that the doctrine commended in the above named address should be propounded to the Christian people as being revealed of God. Our spirit recoils from the discussion of these difficulties; and, confiding in Thy benevolence, we implore that the necessity of such deliberations may not be imposed upon us.’

This is signed by men who speak of themselves as ‘prostrate at thy feet.’ This passage, however, stood in the German Address alone. The others wished to get as many signatures as they could, and perhaps fancied that they gained ground with the Curia by omitting plain objections to the principle. The American Address indicated the existence of differences on the point of principle, by alleging as its first reason against raising a discussion on infallibility, that such a discussion would ‘clearly show a want of union, and especially of unanimity among the bishops.’ The German, French, and Italian Addresses put forward another point, namely, that the dignitaries belonging as they did to *the most important Catholic nations*, and knowing the probable effects of the proposed measures, felt

¹ *Documenta*, i., 250 ff.; *Friedberg*, 473 ff.

that those effects, even with the best men, would be damaging to the cause of the Church, and would supply unfriendly ones with occasion for new invasions of her rights.¹ The German Address, as printed in the *Documenta*, has forty-six signatures, including two Cardinals and the Primate of Hungary; one American prelate, Mrak, of Sault Sainte Marie, in Michigan, closed the list. The French Address has thirty-eight names, and among these are three Portuguese prelates and four Orientals. The Italian Address has seven names, the American twenty-seven—among which two Irish sees, Kerry and Dromore, are represented, and a single English one, Clifton. The Oriental Address has seventeen.²

M. Veuillot, speaking of the Opposition Addresses as one whole, said that of all who had signed it, not two, perhaps not one, was opposed to infallibility in principle (i., p. 149). Later he had the candour to attack the bishops for having impugned not only the opportuneness of the definition, but the doctrine itself (i., p. 180). Archbishop Manning, however, even after the close of the Council, said, 'I have never been able to hear of five bishops who denied the doctrine of Papal infallibility.'³ This particular statement is advanced as evidence of a general one, that the question raised among the bishops 'was a question of prudence, policy, expediency; not of doctrine or truth.' A question not of doctrine or of truth! Forty-six prelates in a petition expressly directed against Dr. Manning's own Address had put the question as one not only of prudence, but of revealed truth, alleging against any attempt to define the dogma three classes of obstacles—those arising out of Catholic doctrine, out of the *dicta* and acts of the Fathers, and out of historical documents. Perhaps we ought, with the

¹ *Documenta ad Illustrandum*, i., p. 251.

² Bishop Martin's *Collectio Documentorum* gives nearly the same numbers, but seems to omit the American Address. It gives Schwarzenberg's note fixing the sum at 136. Dupanloup frequently calls it 140. See his reply to Deschamps.

³ *Priv. Pet.*, iii., p. 27.

forty-six prelates, to say *genuine* historical documents. But Englishmen must be forgiven if in their limited intercourse with the Papacy they have not yet found it necessary to put labels on such words. The Donations of Constantine, and the Decretals of the Pseudo-Isidore, are historical documents, and also genuine as specimens of forgeries.

The fate of the Opposition petition is wrapped in mystery. Who presented it? how was it received? what became of it? are questions to which the satisfactory answer must be left to time. Some asserted that the Pope refused to receive it. Quirinus says that he returned it (p. 174). M. Veuillot told how it was delivered at the Vatican by an ordinary messenger, and that a monsignore received it with ordinary papers. This public affront to two Cardinals and nearly a hundred and forty bishops was aggravated a few days later by the remark that it was not yet known whether the monsignore had ever thought well to deliver the Address. Still later it was said that the Pope being consulted as to what was to be done with it, said that it might go to the Commission on Proposals, he intending, personally, to ignore it (i., p. 202). At a yet later date, January 28th, Friedrich learned that every one being afraid to present it, Cardinal Schwarzenberg sent it by his chamberlain, who delivered it to Monsignor Ricci, the Pope's chamberlain. The Pope was excessively angry, and ordered it to be sent to the Commission.

When M. Veuillot trumpeted forth this example of how to deal with cardinals, archbishops, and bishops, did he mean to suggest that other Courts might treat them with like neglect,—Courts to which these officials hold themselves related as citizens only in an inferior order, an order which 'obliges' them only when the higher order does not contravene? The documents in question bore the signatures of the Sees of Prague, Vienna, Munich, Cologne, Mainz; those of Milan and Turin; those of Paris, Rheims, Orleans, and the principal Sees of Portugal; those of New York, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Halifax, and St. John; those

of Kerry and Dromore, and of Clifton ; and from ancient countries the signatures of Antioch, Babylon, Tyre, Sidon, and Seleucia. Not often in the history of manners have titles representing so many ancient claims and such considerable modern station been treated with equal courtesy.

The *Univers* of January 30th¹ said that when the minority thought that the majority were about to come to a decisive vote, they sent Bishop Freppel, or some one else, to propose conciliation ; but when reassured, they began their opposition afresh. It further said that Cardinal Hohenlohe acted in Rome in the interests of his brother, the Minister, and that his theologian, Friedrich, who had been chosen by Döllinger, was the writer of the letters in the *Augsburg Gazette*; that Cardinal Hohenlohe, with Schwarzenberg and Haynald, had succeeded in making an impression at certain embassies ; and that the Austrian ambassador put the petition against infallibility before bishops, and asked if they had signed it.

The annual celebration of the Adoration of the Magi, as we call it, or the Adoration of the Kings, as Rome, with her political instinct, calls it, was for this year turned to account for a series of discourses, which Vitelleschi labels ‘Pure essence of the *Città Cattolica*.’ This being the case, we flatter ourselves that the reader is, by this time, in a position to compose a sermon or two for his own edification. Friedrich said that even the French clergy exclaimed against the ‘idolatry of the Pope’ displayed by their bishops on this occasion. Vitelleschi, representing the Romans, true to their habits, says that they remarked that so many Cardinals had died lately, that fifteen red hats appeared in the air, and some of the Fathers of the Council, taking them for tongues of fire, allowed themselves to be inspired by them.

Not content with the far-reaching policy which aimed ultimately at a cosmopolitan counter-revolution, the party of movement desired to begin forthwith by a local counter-

... ¹ Quoted *Tagebuch*, p. 155.

revolution. Italy was to be reconstituted as a confederation of four States—the Papal States, Naples, Tuscany, and Piedmont. This, cries Friedrich, is a new task for a Council,—a Council called to make a revolution!¹ But the bishops knew more of the world than the Curia.

Party spirit now ran high. Those who had adopted the tactics of opposing infallibility only on the ground of opportuneness, while they really objected on principle, found that they had gained nothing in point of conciliation, and had lost almost everything in point of moral power. How could ordinary consciences understand a man who admitted, or seemed to admit, that a doctrine, affecting the representative of God on earth, was true, and yet denied that it ought to be proclaimed? Compared with this position, that of the Pope was both sensible and Christian. ‘We must never fear to proclaim the truth or to condemn error.’ Many, as well as Dupanloup, who first departed from the false line that he had seemed to mark out, found that they must object to the principle. Even if they had not previously studied the question at all, the glaring attempts now made to palm off admissions of primacy for assertions of infallibility opened their eyes. An ex-Anglican like Manning might easily accept that or grosser fallacies, but others had been taught to distinguish. The party of movement, on the other hand, raised a cry for action, which swelled higher at every sign of opposition. Their allegations are briefly expressed by Sambin (p. 105):—

‘Pontifical infallibility is the sign to be spoken against. If it is defined, the question is near to its settlement. The Catholic social Liberalism of France, and the scientific Liberalism of Germany, are indeed menaced. It is, therefore, a question of life or death for Liberalism, as for Gallianism and Febronianism.’

The opposition to ‘the divine prerogatives of the Pontiff,’ says this author,¹ ‘had now become so pronounced that it was necessary to act.’² Saviours of society always come to that point on the eve of the *coup d'état*.

¹ *Tagebuch*, 155.

² P. 112.

M. Veuillot, who had long endeavoured to smother the opposition by asserting that no opposition existed, now declared that the opposition was so grave that it made the proposed definition a necessity. Quirinus says that the Address in favour of infallibility owes its preponderance of signatures principally to the three hundred *boarders* and the South Americans, while the counter-address represents 'the overwhelming predominance in numbers of souls, in intelligence, and in national importance' (p. 173). One topic of constant complaint on the part of the Opposition was the disproportionate number of bishops to people in Italy as compared with other nations. For the seven hundred thousand people then in the Papal States there were sixty-two bishops, while for the twelve million Catholics of Germany there were fourteen. One million seven hundred thousand in the diocese of Breslau had but a single prelate, and he was not placed on any committee whatever. The nine millions of ignorant and superstitious people in Naples and Sicily had no less than sixty-eight bishops. On the other side of this question, M. Veuillot played off the name of London. If Paris and Vienna, Munich and Lyons, Milan and Turin, were on the wrong side, the Archbishop of London was on the right one.

Spalding, Archbishop of Baltimore, issued a project for a decree which, without formally defining the dogma of infallibility, should bind all to an interior assent to the infallibility of Papal decrees in faith or morals. He pointed out the evils attendant on a formal definition, and that in a manner which afterwards enlivened the controversy between Dupanloup, Deschamps, and himself. The work wherewith Deschamps regaled his Christmas Day was that of proposing no less than ten *anathemas*;¹ for if the Fathers could not propose things in Council, they could send a suggestion to the committee. Ten new anathemas dated expressly on the Nativity of our Lord by a Christian bishop ! That day Reisach died.

¹ *Martin's Collection*, p. 91.

CHAPTER VII.

Matters of Discipline—Remarks of Friedrich on the Morals of the Clergy—Also on the War against Modern Constitutions—Morality of recent Jesuit Teaching—Darboy's Speech—Melcher's Speech—A Dinner Party of Fallibilists—One of Infallibilists—Gratry—Debate on the Morals of the Clergy.

THE Draft Decrees on discipline now in the hands of the bishops affected their remaining rights. It had taken three hundred years to develop the practical effects of the legislation of Trent in curtailing those rights. The position and spirit of the bishops at the opening of the Council of Trent, as compared with those of their successors at the Vatican, may be illustrated by that of British peers in contrast with that of French senators of the Second Empire. Paolo Sarpi may say that the prelates entered Trent as bishops and left it as parsons; but it was long before new regulations had worn down old procedure so far that an Archbishop of Paris, for instance, could be treated in the manner in which we have seen Darboy treated. The bishops, however, now feared, says Vitelleschi, lest their office should be further mutilated.

According to Friedrich (p. 88), when, at one of the first meetings of the German and Hungarian prelates, Strossmayer said that the matter before them was the resignation of their collective rights and the centring of the whole in the hands of the Pope, he was ridiculed; but when he repeated that statement on Saturday, January 8th, it was received with universal assent. On the other hand, Roman ecclesiastics were alarmed at the pretensions of the bishops. Two Dominicans begged Cardinal Hohenlohe to use his influence to prevent the Germans from speaking as extravagantly as the French. 'It is really frightful,' they said; 'what is to become of Rome? These bishops want spiritual decentralisation.' Friedrich now thinks that he begins to see what is the religious principle of the Roman clergy—domination, as a means of existence. The bearing of this remark on spiritual decentralisation rests on the fact that

8/117

spiritual causes referred to Rome bring money to the bureaux, and the bureaucracy are the clergy.

The professional observations of Friedrich on the Drafts touching discipline give insight into certain interior aspects of Romanism, which affect not only its own condition, but, through it, affect all society. We therefore let him speak directly (p. 89, ff.) :—

'The first chapter on the Office of a Bishop closes so abruptly that only at the end is it said that bishops must be examples for the flock. It is, however, praiseworthy that they are told to take the lead of the faithful even in knowledge. Alas for this pious wish ! It will be as it has been ! Further on, the words "let ecclesiastical discipline be maintained" strike the eye, and that in respect of the *mulieres subintroductæ*, or *γυναικες συριστατοι*, in which character the parsonage cooks appear. This regulation is the most insulting imaginable ; the most degrading for the parish priest, the most lowering and humiliating for the curates ; altogether a dark spot in Church life. No regulation stands in such glaring contrast with Canons and Councils. It is a great offence against Christian morality, by which it is forbidden that any one should be placed in proximate occasion of sin ; but in this manner the independence of a clergyman, and the placing of him in proximate occasion of sin, are connected together. The Fathers of the Council must themselves say whether this is or is not the greatest of cankers in the life of the clergy. They can tell whether it is necessary to direct the attention of the Council to this sore spot. One of the Fathers of the Council himself told me that he once spent a night in a parsonage where the rural dean (Dechant) and the cook were parents of both curates. It is said in the Draft, *De vita et honestate clericorum* : "If a clergyman, unmindful of his own dignity, is given to immodest defilements or to impure concubinage, or dares either in his house or elsewhere to have a woman of whom suspicion may be entertained, or to seek her company, let him be proceeded against, with the penalties prescribed by the sacred Canons, especially by the Council of Trent, and that without noise or the forms of a trial, only by simple inquiry into the truth of the facts." But what will this avail ? Those directions have long existed, yet things go on as of old, and any such directions must necessarily be insufficient. Why is not the regulation of the ancient Church once more taken up, and carried through with a firm hand, according to which every woman, except nearest relations, was suspected, and was not to be admitted to the house of a clergyman ? If our Church-princes of to-day will not return to the old regulation, which indeed sufficed not to hinder all excesses, and if they are incapable of finding new and better ones, it would be preferable, at all events, and would involve less responsibility for them, if they allowed their clergy to marry outright rather than give them up to

arrangements which place their reputation in so ambiguous a light. The fact that this subject had to be brought forward here in its regular place is sad enough, and should be taken as proof that we cannot go on in the present way. Has it not already come to this, in certain dioceses, that the bishops find themselves obliged to hush up, rather than to punish?

' Further on, in the same chapter, it is said, " While they preach to the people due reverence and obedience towards the powers of this world, let them all with one mind and heart, taking counsel together and uniting their deliberations and strength, earnestly maintain the rights of the Church and of this Holy See, so that their common guard and defence may more perfectly assure the interests of the common cause; but let them admit of nothing which will lower the honour and dignity of their rank, and let them keep the admonitions of the Council of Trent on this point under their eye." These sentences are doubtless well meant; but, practically, will be without result. Nothing is gained by such general propositions. This being self-evident, nothing should be said in Decrees of a Council beyond the laying down of positive directions. The conclusion of the chapter is vague, but, perhaps, very dangerous. " We require princes and magistrates to cover and protect the sacred chief pastors (antistites) and ministers of the Church, and their most excellent work, with their powerful patronage and defence, *that due honour, respect, and obedience may be paid by all to the ecclesiastical authority.* Knowing that bishops promote not only the cause of the Church, but also that of their nations, and that above all the boldness and wickedness of men who perversely seek to mislead minds and corrupt manners may be restrained and constrained by them in the exercise of their pastoral office."

' First of all, what is meant here by "most excellent or highest work (*optimam operam*)? who are included in *by all* (*ab omnibus*)? Not only is honour to be paid to the spiritual authority by all, but obedience. According to the notes, *by all* includes princes and nations; that by the Council princes and nations may be moved to venerate the sacred pastors, and to render them obedience and reverence. Are we to understand that the unbelievers and misbelievers in a State are to pay obedience to the bishops? Does this wrap up the mediæval notion that heretics after all are under the jurisdiction of the Catholic Church, as Bishop Martin lately gave himself out as the bishop of the heretics in his diocese? Also that unbelievers have no moral right of existence, and so on? And what is meant by the concluding words? Do they imply that the bishops have a right of interfering with the freedom of the press, of belief, and of conscience as granted by modern constitutions? A General Council should speak clearly and definitely.¹

¹ We should be curious to know if the writer would now comment on these terms so doubtfully. Further study would probably have given greater decision. The meaning of the obedience of princes and nations was as distinct

'But who would have believed that in the second chapter on the Residence of Bishops a condemnation of the constitutional usages of modern times should be attempted, even indirectly? It provides that bishops must not be absent from their sees more than two, or at the utmost three, months in a year, whether continuously or at intervals. Such absence cannot be allowed even for causes otherwise admitted as lawful—*alias jure admissis*—except by express permission of the Pope, or, in the United Greek Churches, without the permission of the Patriarch. One is here compelled to ask, Could not those cases have been foreseen in which seats in Upper Houses are permanently connected with many bishoprics. Why this needless increase of requests for dispensation? But, according to the *Civilità Cattolica*, it is only as compelled by existing circumstances that bishops can properly take part in the objectionable constitutional life. It is said in the notes that the necessity of an express apostolic permission is to be remembered as being even now required by the constitution of Boniface VIII.—*Sancta synodus*—even if there exists one of the four grounds of absence admitted as legitimate by the Council of Trent in its twenty-third session. These four grounds were, visiting the thresholds of the apostles (i.e., Rome), attending provincial synods, attending a General Assembly in which ecclesiastics are wont to sit, or discharging an office or duty to the State connected with the Churches themselves. But (says the note) because the Decrees of Urban VIII. contemplate assemblies of a kind which do not at present exist, mention of this as a just cause of absence was omitted in the Decree, in which also was omitted, for a similar reason, mention of discharging an office or duty to the State. Thus the Chambers which have taken the place of those ancient assemblies do not exist for the Curia, or it feels bound to ignore them—quite in harmony with Jesuit fantasies. Should the session of the Chamber last more than three months, those Bavarian bishops who are members of the Reichsrath would require an express permission from the Pope to fulfil their duty to the State. They might receive from the Pope a prohibition against staying any longer at the Reichsrath and fulfilling their obligations as citizens. Very edifying for our governments and States! They, however, would know how to help themselves, and would simply withdraw such a seat from the bishop.'

Friedrich then dwells on the new contrivance of centralisation by which every metropolitan is ordered, before publishing the acts of a Provincial Synod, to send them to Rome. The Curia is not to give them any formal approbation, but to *correct them*, should anything seem to call for correction. as possible from that of the obedience of private persons, whether Catholics or heretics. The Church is all through the movement proceeding, as *mother of civil humanity*, to secure the obedience of rulers and States.

After this they are to be issued as the acts of the Provincial Synod. To execute this feat of shaping provincial decrees within the chambers of the Curia, Pius IX. had appointed a new Board or Congregation. Friedrich calls this a new censorship. That would appear to mean that whereas formerly only private authors required an *imprimatur*, now even the collective episcopate of a province requires one. It would, however, seem to involve more than a censorship, because the new matter inserted in Rome has to go before the world under the provincial names. Authors were not compelled to father the corrections of the censor. They could leave the work unpublished.

That sense of impending danger to the Church which, of late years, had weighed on many Catholics, arose not a little from the moral teaching of the Jesuits, whose influence, under the smile of the Pope, they saw gradually rising. Out of regard for the honour of the Church, many Roman Catholics suppressed the horror they felt at what they discovered in the books of the Jesuits. Only those who have read some books—those which reflect the modern phases of their moral teaching—can appreciate the weight that must have lain on the hearts of some good men when striving to uphold before their imagination the Church as the perfection of beauty. Among the disciples of the Church of Rome are many who hold close to the Christian side of her theology, and seem to forget its Pagan side; many who avoid what is material in her cult, and, by aid of that same theology, cherish spiritual worship; many who turn to the noble morals of the Gospel, from the lower and ever deteriorating morals of the schools; and many to whom the secular spirit of the Papacy and the earthly empire aimed at by the Jesuits are repugnant.

Friedrich learned, in Rome, that those who confess to the Jesuits are not to be trusted. Any one who will read even one hundred pages out of the seven hundred of Gury's *Casus Conscientiae* would not think of trusting—would only think of

pitying any creature into whose head the principles of that bad book had been put. Friedrich evidently does not repeat any light talk when he says that he heard it stated, upon good authority, that the Jesuits in Rome were in the habit of employing women as lures to procure the overthrow of men who stood in their way, which women would then return to the Jesuit confessionals as penitent Magdalenes; and this, he adds, the Pope knows right well. When Vitelleschi speaks of the evils arising from severity against errors of the intellect, and indulgence to errors of the will, he means what we should describe as strictness as to Papal principles, and laxity as to moral practices.

According to Vitelleschi, Darboy had only to stretch out his hand to take a Cardinal's hat. The impression that this was the case, and the terms on which he was known to stand with the Curia, gave great interest to his first appearance in the desk, which took place on the 19th of January. How gladly would the Curia have seen him stretch forth his hand in the direction where the hat hung; but no, he reached it out in that direction where he had only reproaches to gather.¹

'We are told that we are not to make long speeches, but I have a great deal to say. We are told again not to repeat what has been said by others; but at the same time we are kept shut up in this Hall, where for the most part we cannot understand one another; we are not allowed to examine the stenographic reports of our speeches, and the only answer made to our representations is always the same, "The Pope wills it." I do not know, therefore, what has been said by the speakers who have preceded me.'

He then went on to speak of the rights of the bishops, of their degradation by the Roman centralising system, of 'the caves wherein the Roman doctors have buried themselves from the light of day,' etc. Two sayings are ascribed to him after this speech. The first, 'Like Condé, I have thrown my marshal's baton into the midst of the enemy; ' and the second, 'This Hall

¹ *Quirinus*, p. 195.

is deaf, dumb, and blind.' Hard as it was for the Curia to listen to Darboy, with his diocese of two millions of nominal Catholics, it is said that they were even more pained by the language of Melchers of Cologne, whose diocese counted one million, and from whom animadversions were not expected. The fear of the French troops forsaking Rome saved the Archbishop of Paris from the tinkling of the mystic bell; but it arrested the metropolitan of the Rhine Province.

Melchers strongly objected to the increase of centralisation in Rome, and advocated decentralisation. He declared that, as now employed, dispensations from Rome were not necessary. Cardinal De Luca interrupted him, and told him that he was not speaking to the point, and that he must send his proposals to the Commission. He replied that he had sent his proposals to Rome long ago, and had received no answer; and then proceeded with his speech. An attack on centralisation and on dispensations, from such a prelate, was a practical matter in Rome, as much as in Manchester would be a movement to cut off all the customers in some great county.

On the 23rd and 24th of January, Cardinal Hohenlohe gave two dinner parties—the first to Fallibilists, and the second to Infallibilists. At the former, Hefele, who now reappears on the scene, no longer as theologian, but as Bishop of Rottenburg, complained that he had lost the important sitting of that morning through an order from Cardinal Antonelli to attend the baptism of a child of the ex-Duke of Parma, which eleven other prelates who like him had apartments in the Quirinal were also obliged to attend, and at which six Cardinals gave their presence. Ex-princes pass here, says Friedrich, as if they were reigning ones; but he doubts if the Council will replace them on their thrones. Friedrich, influenced by the contrast of Hefele's learning with the lack of it in many bishops, evidently overrates him as a councillor. To prove that he was skilled in parliamentary usages, he quotes an observation of Hefele which might be taken to prove the

opposite, namely, that the Rules showed that their framers had never sat in a large assembly. They showed that the framers had minutely studied the usages of such assemblies, and perfectly knew what would answer their own end. That end was, not to secure a combination of order with freedom of proposition and debate, but to secure order without freedom of proposition, and with hampered forms of speaking. For this end the Rules were well devised, and some of their bad features had Hefele's sanction.

Archbishop Melchers of Cologne did not flatter Friedrich by telling him, what he already knew, that his Grace had forbidden his theological students to go to the faculty at Munich. His Grace, says Friedrich, did know the name of Döllinger, but not that of Reithmayer; and as to those of the younger professors, not the name of one. The Archbishop of Munich was not able to resist the temptation of telling Friedrich, as a good story, that when the bishops at Fulda, in the previous autumn, spoke of recommending Friedrich's Church History to the clergy, as a work which they ought to procure, his Grace of Cologne confessed that he did not know the name of the book. The pendant which the author archly hangs to this tale is, that when the copy of that work which he had presented to his Grace of Munich fell, after some years, again into his hands, it had never been opened.

One of the explanations of the Archbishop of Munich to the Bavarian ambassador in Rome was that the appearance in his organ, the *Pastoral Blatt*, of the recent Bull on Censures, or Excommunications, was not a promulgation of it in his diocese, for it had only been copied by the paper, without any authority from the Ordinary. Bishop Förster of Breslau mentioned how Ketteler was going to propose, in the meeting of German and Hungarian prelates, that they should disavow the letters in the *Augsburg Gazette*; but, said Förster, we stand too high, and besides, the letters contain too many truths. Some one at table threw out the idea that the best thing to be done would

be to give the Drafts of Decrees to the bishops, and let them go home and study them for a year or two, and then return and discuss them. They had come to Rome without books. Points of the greatest gravity in doctrine and discipline were laid before them for decision, and, as every one knew, it was difficult to find help in the libraries of Rome. Even that of the Vatican was closed, not only upon every holy day, but also on all those days on which General Congregations were held. The bishops were not allowed to take either books or manuscripts out of the libraries; still more, both in the Vatican library and the Vatican archives, the order had been given that nothing bearing on the Council should be delivered to them. Their regret at this was lessened by the discovery that the libraries contained scarcely any modern theological works, especially German ones. In his day, Addison remarked that books were not the attractions you went to see in an Italian library. But, of recent years, a real library of books, in addition to the old celebrated one of manuscripts, had been added at the Vatican. It was not catalogued, and was not open to the public. Some one in the company stated that it was now understood that theologians were to be brought into the Council in order to defend the Drafts of Decrees. So far as the *Theologi Minores*, or doctors, were concerned, Friedrich thought this improbable; and as to the higher theologians, or bishops, he wondered who they were to be. Can any one fancy, he said, such a man as Senestrey being treated as a theologian? At Trent, with the ideas then prevailing of what constituted a theologian, he would not have been dreamed of; but he passes in Rome as learned because he is a pupil and a favourite of the Jesuits; and by their standard, indeed, adds his countryman, he may even pass as holy, understanding so well as he does the principle that the end sanctifies the means.

As to what Friedrich next relates, we can only say that the ascertained fact for history, in her present stage, is that the following are things which a learned professor, with a position

What year?

and character to take care of, deliberately publishes, and things which the gravest men receive. Friedrich relates how when Senestrey was seeking the bishopric, King Maximilian II. was in Rome, and often visited Theiner, whose fame all Germans prized. His rooms in the Vatican, off the *Via dei Giardini Pontificali*, well known to scholars, are often pointed out to visitors going up towards the sculpture gallery by the present circuitous approach. Here the royal visitor would chat with the learned Prefect of the Archives, and enjoy the landscape. At that time Theiner had no better friend than Senestrey, who, knowing that Theiner was in bad odour with the Jesuits, showed himself very hostile to them, so that even his experienced friend confessed to Friedrich that he had allowed himself to be deceived. This Roman tale is followed by a Bavarian one. A person well acquainted with official circles told Friedrich that Senestrey actually offered his services to the government, saying that if appointed bishop, in case the other prelates ever entertained anything disagreeable to the government, he would give information and do everything to counterwork them. In January 1872 Friedrich heard Senestrey named in a company where one was present who had been a companion of King Maximilian II. on his journey to Rome, and who broke out saying:—

‘Yes, that man talked so much in Rome to King Maximilian II. and his suite against the Jesuits and against the misgovernment of Rome, that the King said, That is the right man! He must be the bishop!’

No sooner was he in the bishopric than it proved that the king had lost his subject, the government its supporter, Theiner his friend, and that the whole of Senestrey belonged to the Jesuits.

The company of the second day, January 24th, consisted of Infallibilists. Before dinner Friedrich was introduced to Senestrey, who looking at him, said roughly, ‘So you are Professor Friedrich,’ and turned his back. At table Ketteler broke out in loud denunciation of the letters of Quirinus. This Friedrich knew was meant for him, for although the bishop has since then laid the sin at the door of Lord Acton,

he seems at that time to have suspected Friedrich. He blamed a statement that a certain piece of distinctive attire, not worn by any other bishop in the West, had been granted to Bishop Lavigerie of Algiers to adorn his shoulders, as a means of winning his vote; As if, said Ketteler, the whole episcopate was to be bought by a bit of dress! We do not remember that Quirinus said that they were all to be bought by it. Our impression is that he only said something to the effect that it was incredible how far that sort of thing did go with them. Considering their training and habits, with us the thing incredible would be that things of that sort should not go far with them. And their constant study is to make things of that sort go far with all mankind. But the sally of Ketteler was responded to by the Military Bishop of Prussia, Namszanowski, who might be supposed to be even more than others susceptible of colour and decoration. He, evidently not being well read in Quirinus, missed the point of Ketteler's protest, and said, 'Quite right, brother of Mainz. The same offer was made to me just at the outset, but I repelled such an imputation with contempt.' This luckless reply probably made Friedrich think of his own visit from the much-vested Count Prelate W—. The eye of Ketteler flashed. Friedrich, who sat next to Namszanowski, hinted that he had missed the point of Bishop Ketteler, who ranted on—*tobte weiter*. When he had finished his tirade he looked Friedrich in the eye, as if to see whether he was not well abashed. 'But I had no occasion to fear Ketteler, and looked him in the eye quite as sharply.' Just after coffee the voice of Ketteler made the room ring,—'The chief advantage of the Council so far is, that the bishops learn to know one another, and to compare experience. For in his own diocese, of course, a bishop never hears the truth from his clergy, in consequence of his immeasurably higher jurisdiction.' Friedrich, being the only priest present, said to Namszanowski, 'Ketteler must lead a pretty regiment, when his clergy dare not tell him the truth. Any one who wants to hear the truth, and can

bear to hear it, will hear it.' He added that were it not for the impropriety of provoking a scene in the house of Cardinal Hohenlohe, he would indignantly repel this insult to the whole of the lower clergy. None of the bishops intimated any dissent from the view of Ketteler, while Senestrey, and Leonrod of Eichstädt, simpered approbation. But here Friedrich inserts a note saying, Time has shown that Ketteler knew the lower clergy better than I did.

Just at this time came another token that the content or indifference with which the Roman Catholic world watched the impending change in its Church and creed was broken in exceptional cases. An accomplished French oratorian, a member of the Academy, Father Gratry, published a letter on January 18th, which in almost any other country than France, coming from such a man on such a subject, at such a moment, would have caused, not a passing talk, but a profound impression. All the abuse was no longer for Döllinger and Montalembert. Father Gratry had a share allotted to him, sufficient to prove his importance. 'Does God need your lies?' was a question he repeated with solemnity, as he dwelt on the false decretals and on the falsifications even of the breviary. His French clearness and point sent these reproaches home so as to be extremely cutting. It seemed as if accusing 'the Church' of lying and forgery was a sin not to be forgiven. Few things were more discouraging for those who hoped that moral ground still remained for a reformation within the Church of Rome, than the perfect ease with which the benefits of the lying and the forgery were accepted, and the fury with which the crime of mentioning those incidents was denounced. 'False decretals as much as you like,' said Veuillot, 'but the sense of the false decretals is the faith of the Church';¹ so, if God had not needed the lies the Church had assimilated them. Father Gratry, said the *Civilité*, never tires of calling the school which teaches pontifical infallibility, a school of error. Does he know where

¹ Vol. i., p. 235.

that school has fixed its abode, and holds its chair? If he does not know, we shall tell him. Its home is Rome, its chair is that of the Roman Pontiff, is that of St. Peter.¹ Father Hyacinth said, at a later time, 'God never has need of lies, but lies often have need of God, and they are never so powerful as when they present themselves in His name.'²

Still, the weight of wrath continued to fall upon the original offender. The *Unità Cattolica* of January 25th, in the letter of its Munich correspondent, called Döllinger a bag of wind and a whitened sepulchre, and suggested that the Archbishop of Munich should prohibit theological students from attending his classes. Just at this time the *Unità* was intent upon settling everything by the laws of the Council,—one day saying that nothing could stop duelling but the laws of the Council; another day that suicide could not be checked but by renewing the canon law against the memory of suicides. A few days later (Feb. 2nd), parliaments are called puppet-shows in comparison with the Council. 'Oh! if parliaments were only modelled on the Council! But for that we must have bishops for deputies.' If bishops were to be prefects, as M. Veullot foretold, and also deputies, as Don Margotti suggested, all the world would soon resemble the Model³ State. But be this as it may, the *Unità* shows that Dr. Döllinger in his works 'has always hidden a rebellious spirit under a learning which was often that of a charlatan.'

In the General Congregation of the 21st, as the Cyprian Archbishop who said Mass used the Oriental rite, the Fathers would have been unable to follow, but the Master of the Ceremonies, lifting up his voice, gave a signal for each important movement.⁴ In the Congregation of the Monday, Strossmayer spoke for an hour and a quarter (*Tagebuch*, p. 133). He insisted that reform was called for, and reform from the Pope down-

¹ Serie VII., vol. ix., p. 685.

² Letter to the *Débats*, printed in *Le Concile du Vatican, et le Mouvement Anti-infaillibiliste*, vol. ii., p. 63.

³ *Acta Sanctorum Sedis*, v., p. 341.

wards, and moreover that the whole of the canon law should be reformed. On the following Tuesday, this last proposition was supported by the Bishop of Saluzzo. On the same day, a speaker not named regretted that the word 'concubinage' should have been used, as it gave occasion to the world to say that celibacy was a failure. Friedrich, while vehemently sharing this regret, admits that no means were suggested for doing away with concubinage or immorality. The Curia, however, could not be blamed for the scandal caused by the discussion on this matter of discipline. No one of the official organs ever breathed a word on the subject. Monsignor Guérin, whose history, says the preface to the second edition, reproduces the Council entire, might never have heard of this subject, and the same is the case with Sambin. The *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, even in Latin, are equally reserved. The title of the Draft Decree on the general subject of the life of the clergy is mentioned in *Frond*. Henceforth we cease to be able to check the statements of the unauthorised writers by those of the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis* as to the names of those who spoke on given days. That amount of information was no more afforded. One day the record was that five spoke, another seven, and so forth. Who the speakers were, what they spoke upon, what they said about it, were matters swallowed up in the pontifical secret.

On the same day, the challenge to the College of Cardinals to reform itself was taken up by Cardinal Di Pietro, who admitted that such a demand might have been reasonable at Trent, at which time the Cardinals held many pluralities, but at the present day it was groundless. The only reform now called for was a financial one, as the revenue of the Cardinals was not adequate. He told the Fathers that if they only knew all, the Cardinals were not to be envied. This even Friedrich admits, saying that not once during the Council had the Pope summoned them to hear their opinions.

On January 27th, Simor, Primate of Hungary, spoke on the life of the clergy, and recommended the 'common life.' Martin

of Paderborn also advised that the cooks¹ should be superseded, and that 'common life' should be resorted to. Martin had appealed to Cardinal Hohenlohe to support him in a proposal that Protestant clergymen who wanted to join the Church of Rome should have both marriage and the cup in the Lord's Supper conceded to them. Verot, Bishop of Savannah, spoke on the breviary. He urged revision, stating that he durst not, without subjecting himself to condemnation, say what was in the breviary from Augustine. Hereupon the bell of Cardinal De Angelis rang loudly, and Verot was told that the Fathers could not be spoken of in that manner. As we understand Verot, he had not found fault with the Fathers. The sons would not allow one another to say what the fathers had said. The American waited a moment, went on, and said the same thing of Gregory the Great. Now came a second call to order, and he was told that if he would not speak on another subject, he must leave the desk. So, after a few words more, he did leave it (*Tagebuch*, p. 138). The Prince Archbishop of Olmütz asked if the Primate of Hungary was ready to lead the 'common life' with the canons of his chapter, adding that he should not object to lead it with his own chapter, but he feared that the canons of Olmütz would object. The following day, Melchers of Cologne supported the views of Verot as to the breviary. He censured the proposal to introduce lay brothers into the parsonages instead of the cooks. It would be better if the latter could be altogether got rid of; but as that was scarcely to be expected, it would be well to require that they should be fifty years of age, or at least forty. On the 31st of January, Bishop Dinkel of Augsburg is said to have spoken against concubinage in the strict sense, but allowing it to the clergy in a wider sense.²

¹ We use Friedrich's word. Housekeeper is the one generally employed in languages other than the German.

² Fromman, p. 96. As a Protestant author, Fromman is hardly ever quoted by us; but he is so careful, and in this case so specific as to date and person, that we do not feel at liberty to suppress his statement.

— months are
January last met. Letter of 200.

Perhaps, as, about the middle of January, men in the *Englisher Garten*, or Park, of Munich, lifted their hats to the Provost as he took his afternoon walks, they might fancy that the spare figure was weighted with rather more than a scholar's gravity, and that the countenance bore signs of introspection more intense than comes of mere thought. Neither the passing carriages, nor the race of *Isar* rolling rapidly; neither the fine effects of the westering sun behind the steeples of the city, nor the pleasant view from the brow beyond the river, could fix the old man's well-lighted eye. That eye was then watching the process which was putting the faith and labour of seventy years to a cruel test. The Church he had toiled to rehabilitate before the intellect of the Fatherland, striving, by letters, to connect her more firmly with the past, and to equip her more nobly for the future, had been cast into the cauldron. The very basis of dogma was to be changed. What his teachers had taught him, what he for nearly half a century had been teaching his pupils as the indispensable test of additional dogmas, was now to be dispensed with, and a new standard was to be set up, which, he had learned and taught, was not of authority. The adoption of that standard would change the relation of the Church to the Bible and to the Fathers, to General Councils and to the Episcopate, to the people and the king, to letters and all lights, to liberties, constitutions, and every human hope. Principles which had been charged upon them by Protestants, and which they had resented, saying that the accusers confounded opinion with dogma, Court maxims with statute, were now lifting their heads in a General Council. He had striven in silence to avert the evil without raising a conflict of persons or names. But now the Infallibilists felt their conscience oppressed by having to recognise him, and those like-minded with him, as Catholics. They could not enjoy the fulness of their own belief as long as the Church tolerated his creed. And the Infallibilists were the Pope, the Curia, the Jesuits, and the majority of the bishops, at least of the nominal ones. Just as surely as the shadows were

lengthening on the snow, as surely as the breath of winter was binding the streams, so surely was the cold hand of absolutism, thrice absolute, closing in like a vice upon the Church, compressing her into a sect shut up within the will of a single person. If there was yet a hope, it rested in the strong help which God often gives to the effort of one self-risking man. The moment was come either to run all hazards and trust to that blessing, or to float down the stream like one of those winter leaves on the Isar.

It was on the 19th of January, just when Gratry was issuing the first of his letters, and when Darboy threw his marshal's baton into the midst of the enemy, that in the quiet house in Von der Tann Street, the formidable name of Döllinger was signed to a protest against the Infallibilist Address. Through the *Augsburg Gazette*, this presently rang all over Germany, and a little later echoed in every corner of Europe. ‘One hundred and eighty millions of human beings are to be compelled, by threats of exclusion from the Church, of privation of the sacraments, and of eternal damnation, to believe and profess what hitherto the Church has never believed or taught.’ So began an appeal destined to elicit proof that large numbers of educated Roman Catholics, under all their external quiet, were agitated; and that at the same time the masses, whatever little opinions they might have, were as to action completely under the dominion of the priests.¹

Few instances of the way in which, under the friction of a historical struggle, terms alter their signification, are more curious than the change which was now passing upon the term ‘Catholic.’ The Court party had long forced it to stand for the opposite of Liberal. Now a further step was taken. Döllinger was proudly told by the oracular *Civilitá* that when he asserted that Catholics did not believe any matters with *divine faith*, but those in which dissent excluded from the Church, he confounded mere divine faith with divine Catholic faith. Not so,

¹ Friedberg, p. 495. Also reprinted separately in *Stimmen aus der Katholischen Kirche*.

15/2. 1

Dupanloup replies to Deschamps.

175

cried the *Civiltà*. Dissent from what is believed with divine faith, that is, on the authority of the Word of God, taints not a man with heresy ; but dissent from what is believed with Catholic faith, that is, on the authority of definitions of the Church, does so taint him. Here the epithet 'divine' is made to denote what tolerates difference of views, and the epithet 'Catholic' to denote what does not. And it is admitted that things may be believed by divine faith independently of the sanction of the Church. It follows that her sanction cannot form the basis of divine faith, but the basis only of Catholic faith. This is but an unconscious confirmation of the obvious truth that all that can be done by such a standard of faith as that set up by Rome is, not to determine what is Christian doctrine, but only what are the denominational conditions of membership. The venerable word 'Catholic' is made to stand as the opposite both of 'liberal' in opinion and of 'divine' in faith. The assumed superiority of divine Catholic faith over *mere divine* faith is natural to Jesuits and the Vatican.

It was now that Dupanloup wrote a letter to Deschamps, Archbishop of Malines. Two days after the opening session, Deschamps had published a reply to the famous pastoral of Dupanloup. It was at once inserted in the journals of Belgium, France, and Italy. Dupanloup, who had in France professed to expect in Rome profound tranquillity, found himself sharply attacked. He had warily reserved the merits of the question for argument in the secret ear of the Council, treating before the public only its accidents. But, cried Deschamps, you have pointed out the difficulties of a definition : how could you have the courage to do so ?

When the brilliant Bishop of Orleans was ready for the press, he found that the press was in good keeping.

'Father Spada [the censor] told me that an *imprimatur* was necessary, and at the same time said that such an *imprimatur* would be refused to me. Perhaps, Monsignor, you probably will think with me that, in these circumstances, all discussion between us is impossible ; and you

will feel it natural that I should preserve the silence befitting the position in which we are placed.'¹

The French thus saw their own prelates, under their own flag, deprived of the right to defend opinions identified with their national history. This fired Gratry, and added fresh bitters to the cup of the dying Montalembert.

Quirinus says (p. 201):—

‘The word “ freedom ” has nowhere so ill a sound as at Rome. Only one kind of freedom can be spoken of here—freedom of the Church ; and, in their favourite and accustomed manner of speech, by the Church is intended the Pope ; and by freedom, dominion over the State, according to the Decretals.’

Some weeks later, Dupanloup did print his reply in Paris.² You, he said to Deschamps, ask how I could have the courage to point to the historical difficulties of a definition of infallibility ; but, my dear Lord, I ask you, how you can have the courage to close your eyes to them ? Repelling the idea of acclamation, and insisting on a thorough sifting of the matter, he says, and the emphases are his own :—

‘The Church in an act so solemn, one which she never recalls, ONE WHICH PLEDGES HER FOR EVER, ONE WHICH, UNDER PAIN OF ANATHEMA AND OF DAMNATION ETERNAL, IS LAID UPON THE FAITH OF ALL SOULS FOR ALL AGES, does not proceed inconsiderately, or without having elucidated all obscurities and difficulties (p. 8). . . . As to the truth of the doctrine, I reserve the discussion of that for the Council itself, in case the question is brought on (p. 9). . . . You belong not to that deplorable school of apologists who fancy that they are defending religion when they make history lie ’ (p. 15).

He shows how even Spalding and his associates in their proposal for a method of establishing belief in infallibility different from an express definition, said that such a definition would

‘extend its effects to all past centuries, would revive all the disputes heretofore allayed, would afford to Protestant and to rationalistic science a new battle-field, and would open up to the enemies of the Church a discussion upon the whole field of history, and the whole of the collection of Papal Bulls (p. 14). Quoting Melchior Canus, he says : Peter has

¹ Friedberg, p. 87.

² *Réponse de Mgr. L'Évêque d'Orléans à Mgr. Deschamps.* Duniol, 1870.

not need of your lies, or of your adulations. . . . To no one, my Lord, will it be agreeable in Rome, and amid the difficult circumstances wherein we stand, to engage in a discussion as to the common Father, in an investigation of the most delicate facts of history, and in a dissection of texts of Scripture before Europe and before the world which are observing us (p. 16). . . . The Fathers at Nicæa did not proceed by way of a summary discussion, much less by way of acclamation written or oral' (p. 17).

A few other expressions of Dupanloup may be recited:—

'Far from putting an end to the discussions in the press, it will cause them to break out more terrible than ever. . . . If the difficulties, theological and historical, of a definition are such that simply exhibiting them as I did involves by inevitable consequence a grave attack on infallibility itself, how could you say that the difficulties are nothing? . . . You had the confident idea that nearly all the Fathers were with you, and were going enthusiastically to vote the definition off-hand (p. 18). . . . Certainly in the Church there must be an infallible doctrinal authority; but is it necessary that this authority should be the Pope **ALONE**? Would it not suffice if it was the authority of the Pope and the bishops united? (p. 20). . . . I asked why Pitt thought it well before taking a step towards Catholic emancipation to consult the most famous Catholic universities of Europe on the question of the pontifical power. You have deemed it well to answer not a word (p. 23). . . . In the ninth century we lost about one-half of the Church; in the sixteenth at least a third of the other half. At the present moment perhaps a half of what remains is more or less broken in upon *entamée*. We have to reconquer. . . . Would you all at once, as several bishops from America said to me yesterday, change for the whole of the Catholic clergy who live in the midst of Protestant populations the entire ground of religious controversy? (p. 24). . . . In France, the Parliament, the Senate, the Legislative Corps, the Councils of State, the public officers, the bench, the bar, the young collegians, the army, the navy, commerce, finance, the arts, the liberal professions, the workmen of the cities, the electors in the country districts, the great mass of those who with us and elsewhere determine the course of affairs,—in a word, the nation, assuredly is not with you (p. 25). . . . Have you not heard the cry of the bishops of Germany, Hungary, Bohemia, and of so many others? (p. 25). . . . Three centuries ago a wave passed over Germany, a wave over England, Holland, Switzerland; and at this hour the wave has not subsided, but is still encroaching on the shore (p. 26). . . . Brazil is sick, Mexico is sick, the old Spanish colonies proceed from revolution to revolution, and it is my mournful conviction that what you, my Lord, are preparing, will give to the Church in all those countries a new and terrible shaking (p. 26). . . . Some say the great evil of our day is that the principle

of authority is laid low. Let us exalt it in the Church, and we shall save society. . . . To think that by proclaiming the infallibility of the Pope you will roll back the revolution is, to my view, one of those illusions which sometimes, in human societies, desperate parties make for themselves on the eve of a supreme crisis' (p. 27).

Forcibly sketching the efforts of the *Civiltà* and the *Univers* to procure an acclamation, and to prevent discussion, he says, in allusion to the first hints :—

'What astonishment was there even in Rome itself among all who were not in the secret, that is among very nearly all! See how, too soon disclosing a plan up to that time skilfully concealed, the *Civiltà* revealed WHAT WAS IN THE AIR. And here is the fact which permits no one to doubt as to the real initiators of the movement. You, my Lord, did not come on till after these strange acts of rashness, but among the bishops you, with Monsignor Manning, did come the first. . . . Eight months ago, and on the 8th of July, in a special publication, you treated the question of opportuneness.'

Without naming Maret, he then says that, on the part of Deschamps, it was neither generous nor equitable to try to excuse his own initiative by charging it upon a book not at the time in existence! Piling up a whole heap of provocations before he intervened, he turns to shame the charge that he began the contest. 'It was in the air,' Deschamps had cried. We know, replies Dupanloup, what rash and violent gusts brought it in; and God grant that it may not hereafter prove that 'they who have sown the wind shall reap the whirlwind.'

'In our petition to the Holy Father we have allowed ourselves to express our astonishment that it should be demanded of judges of the faith that before hearing the case argued they should pronounce their judgment and sign it' (p. 37).

His statement of the condition of things before he first wrote would appear to be meant to depict what existed in Rome as he was now writing :—

'No, it was not unanimity as to the question debated among us which reigned ere I spoke. It was on the one side violence, and on the other side astonishment, silent and downcast. If any voice was raised, speedily was it covered with clamours and insults' (p. 31).

This reply called down from Veuillot many pages of taunts, gibes, and sneers.

Means of humiliating the bishops of the Opposition were found by the sovereign, which seem new in both kingly and parliamentary warfare. Priests wrote against them, and the Pope sent to those priests for publication letters of approval, containing sharp cuts at the unfortunate prelates. To the Jesuit Ramière, the Pope said that he had set Maret 'in contradiction with himself, so that you have constrained him to demolish the edifice with his own hands' (*Friedberg*, p. 490). The Vicar-General of Nîmes had written against Dupanloup, and forth comes an epistle of Pius IX. praising him for his elegant refutation of the empty sophisms which had caused a disturbance of minds deplored by all (*Friedberg*, p. 488).

Among the opponents of infallibility continental Catholic writers generally put Dr. Pusey as one of the most important promoters of the Church of Rome. Yet they were aware that he did not belong to it. In his second pamphlet Dupanloup spoke with feeling of the value of the Ritualistic party, both in England and America, as pointing to Rome. *Ce Qui se Passe au Concile* says (p. iii., troisième éd.),—'In England Dr. Pusey, the originator of the Ritualistic movement, which has led so many persons, eminent for intellect, to the Catholic religion—Pusey, whose loyal sincerity no one ever suspected,' had written that nothing would be more fatal to the prospect of reunion than a declaration of Papal infallibility. This was not likely to make much impression upon the Curia. They knew that what for England was called re-union, for Rome was called submission; which Manning told them would be facilitated by definition; and Manning served them so punctiliously that they were fain to believe him. Moreover, what Desanctis, in that remarkable book *Roma Papale*, had many years previously described as the plan of the Curia for operations in England, would be little affected by a doctrine or two more or less. His account, in one word, was that they would mission England through the senses,

leaving doctrines and arguments in the background. It was a question of spectacle, not of reason or Scripture. And love of spectacle was adorned with the name of æsthetics, and sensible Englishmen were to be led captive by the power of clothes. In this point of view, one who promoted the use of the chosen means might better serve the end from the very fact that he did not himself aim so low.

CHAPTER VIII.

Church and State—Draft of Decrees with Canons—Gains Publicity—Principles involved—Views of Liberal Catholics—The Papal View of the Means of Resistance possessed by Governments.

'INFORMERS against the Church' was, in a word, the name now hurled against the *Augsburg Gazette* and the *Times*. 'Conspirators against human society' was the retort of the general press of Europe upon the Curia. The secret labour of five years was ruthlessly exposed by two unconsecrated offenders. How the 'breach of the pontifical secret' had occurred, of which Cardinal Antonelli complained in despatch after despatch, may perhaps be known some other day. What we now know is that publicity took possession of the results, though secrecy had presided over all the processes. Even the bond of mortal sin had proved too weak for what Curran might have called the irresistible genius of universal illumination. The decrees, canons, and anathemas proposed on the subject of Church and State were now before the world.

On January 21st the Schema, or Draft of Decrees on the Church, were distributed to the bishops. Hefele told how a diplomatist laughingly boasted that he had received one at the same time.¹ This Draft was to that on faith what the application is to the sermon. It laid down principles in fifteen

¹ *Unità Cattolica*, March 4th, quoting *Volksblatt*.

21 Jan'y

chapters, and reduced them to operative shape in twenty-one canons. Vitelleschi says (p. 85) :—

'Now, on summing up these Canons, what do they amount to? Sole religion, the Catholic; sole head, the Pope, "who has full and supreme power;" his laws superior to those of the State, on which he exercises his judgment "concerning the lawful and the unlawful," and disposes of permissions and punishments. Dante has imagined an Emperor and a Pope, who between them shall direct the world; but if the idea of these Canons were fully carried out with regard to civil society, there would remain the Pope only.'

This object, the Pope only, which rests in the logical view of Vitelleschi, as the result of his examination of the Canons, is the same object which long previously stood before the illuminated vision of M. Veuillot, whose means of reaching conclusions were not so circuitous. The Pope only is the object which Archbishop Cecconi even now sets out as the paramount figure of the future, albeit with no extatic confidence. And the Pope only is precisely that crowning beauty in the image of the world-empire which Cardinal Manning reproached Mr. Bryce with missing in his conception of the Catholic universe. Mr. Bryce, like Dante, was a dualist. Dualism, however, was to be done away with, except in the wholesome form of light and darkness, the two opposed forces. According to Vitelleschi, light and darkness are Rome and all that opposes Rome. All the labour and the silence of the recent years had been employed in preparing an inauguration which vulgar eye was not to disturb till the King should burst forth in his plenitude of supreme authority with unerring judgment, so arrayed that all the tribes of Israel would hail the mystic David the one King-shepherd and Shepherd-king of a world at last unified.

The description of the effect of these Canons given by Quirinus (p. 203), was not so elegant as that of Vitelleschi. He wrote for Germans menaced with a change; while the Romans, to whom the Marchese spoke, had for ages been themselves delivered from dualism, and could see in the new measures only an effort to extend to all the human race that perfect

Catholic unity, religious and political, of which their States had been the sole blameless example. They well knew who was the *spiritual David*, the one shepherd of the one fold,—shepherd with sling as well as pipe, shepherd with sword as well as crook,—on whose future reign over one kingdom the eye of the Jesuit, gazing through the glass of Ezekiel, dwelt with rapture, expounding : ‘I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel ; and one king shall be king to them all : and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all. . . . And David my servant shall be king over them, and they all shall have one shepherd.’¹

Quirinus, writing as one to whom this unity had been perhaps gorgeous in the distance, but who saw it now in a new aspect, cried : ‘These transparent Decrees and anathemas may be thus summed up : the Christian world consists simply of masters and slaves. The masters are the Italians, the Pope, and his Court ; and the slaves are all bishops (including the Italians themselves), all priests, and all the laity.’ Whether Quirinus had studied Tarquini’s *à priori* system of the Perfect Society, we do not know ; but any one referring to our analysis of it will see how closely it corresponds with the following, in which Quirinus sums up the doctrine of these Draft Decrees :—

‘Three main ideas run through the Schema, and are formulated into dogmatic Decrees guarded with anathemas. *Firstly*, to the Pope belongs absolute dominion over the whole Church, whether dispersed or assembled in Council. *Secondly*, the Pope’s temporal sovereignty over a portion of the Peninsula must be maintained as pertaining to dogma. *Thirdly*, Church and State are immutably connected ; but in the sense that the Church’s laws always hold good before and against the civil law, and therefore every Papal ordinance that is opposed to the constitution and law of the land, binds the faithful, under pain of mortal sin, to disobey the constitution and law of their country’ (p. 204).

One incidental notice of the Draft by Quirinus is, ‘regulating

¹ See exposition of Ezek. xxxvii. 21-24, *Cirilitá*, VII., vi., 293.

21 Jan'y

all relations between Church and State, and restoring the Papal supremacy over the bodies and souls of men' (p. 209).

The *Rheinischer Merkur* (p. 22) quotes the Ultramontane *Hausblätter* as asserting that the twenty-one Canons had all been long recognised as part of the Catholic faith. No, says the *Merkur*, some of them were repudiated as calumnious by the Catholic bishops of England and Ireland in 1826. On the same page it says :

'We do not want a centralised power of a theocratic complexion, claiming the right of interfering at will, and disturbing our political and social relations, and of reducing princes to vassals—a centralised power claiming that its Decrees shall bind the conscience as divine. . . . We do not want this apparatus of coercion for the Church—*contumaces salubribus paenit coercendi*—for compelling the contumacious by wholesome penalties;—we know what that means! . . . We do not want under-satraps armed with whips; we do not want despotism, which, as well as heresy, is one of the gates of hell. Ready to render to God what is God's, we also wish to render to Cæsar what is Cæsar's, and we count it a precious birthright to be reckoned as good subjects by our lawful sovereigns; but just on this account do we regard Drafts of Decrees, the execution of which would cause us to appear as enemies of public safety and of dynastic order, in the light of attacks on our civil existence, and as calculated to bring us into the same position as that in which our fellow Catholics in the Russian Empire groan.'

What would these Liberal Catholics have said had Reisach's Drafts not been 'shipwrecked'? The twenty-one Canons place the affairs of this world so much at the discretion of the Pontiff, that proposals which alarmed the same men who brought these forward, must have been startling. In principle, they could hardly have claimed more than is claimed here; but possibly they contained formulæ for the application of principle, which might have attracted the attention even of those politicians who think it wise and practical to ignore principles. In nothing is Rome stronger than in her consciousness that when once she has succeeded in getting a principle recognised, she can afford to temporise as to its application, and for a while to compromise as to details. As the preparations of Reisach had been kept back, and the Canons which carried the principles were presented, so we

shall find that the Canons were eventually sacrificed, as too much entering into detail, in order to carry what embraced all.

The Decrees in question were clearly intended as a vehicle to carry over the doctrines of the Syllabus respecting Church and State from the domain of ideas into that of facts. The *Chapters* would furnish text for professors and preachers. The *Canons* would bind the conscience of every Catholic, on pain of anathema. Nothing further could be wanting than executive contrivances, such as probably the Drafts of Reisach were intended to provide.

What English readers at first sight might take for rather wide ecclesiastical propositions, far removed from politics, strike the Roman politician Vitelleschi by the precise and almost geometrical form of the system to which these propositions are reduced (p. 83). Yet even he hands over to theology a subject with which it really has nothing to do. Theologians, he says, must determine what power can remain to bishops if the Pope has full and supreme power, and ordinary and immediate jurisdiction in the dioceses of every one of them. Surely jurists can better determine that than theologians. Theology knows positively nothing of any such absolute power over either the temporal or the spiritual affairs of mankind vested in any human hand. The Bible contains no conception of a God who governs sparrows, much less men, through a Vicar. The Bible knows nothing of man as a creature whose conscience and soul are put under the keeping of a fellow creature. The New Testament knows nothing of a professed Christian minister who only does the bidding of some fellow minister a thousand miles off. The following is an abridged view of the *substance and effect* of the twenty-one Canons (*Documenta*, ii., p. 101):—

1. If any man say that the religion of Christ is not made manifest in a society, let him be anathema.
2. If any man say that the Church has no certain and immutable form, let him be anathema.
3. If any man say that she is not external and visible, let him be anathema.

21 Jan'y

Anathemas.

185

4. If any man say that she is not one body, let him be anathema.
5. If any man say that she is not a society necessary to the obtaining of eternal salvation, let him be anathema.
6. If any man say that her intolerance in the condemnation of all sects is not divinely commanded, or that such sects ought to be tolerated, let him be anathema.
7. If any man say that she may err in doctrine, depart from her original institution, or cease to exist, let him be anathema.
8. If any man say that she is not a final dispensation, let him be anathema.
9. If any man say that her infallibility extends only to things contained in revelation, let him be anathema.
10. If any man say that she is not a Perfect Society, but an association (*collegium*) which may be subjected to secular rule, let him be anathema.
11. If any man say that bishops have not by divine appointment a proper power of ruling, which they are freely to exercise, let him be anathema.
12. If any man say that the power of the Church lies only in counsel or persuasion, but not in legal commands, in coercion and compulsion by external jurisdiction, and in wholesome pains, let him be anathema.
13. If any man say that the true Church, out of which none can be saved, is any other than the Roman, let him be anathema.
14. If any man say that Peter was not prince of the apostles and head of the whole Church, or that he received only a primacy of honour and not of jurisdiction, let him be anathema.
15. If any man say that he had not successors, or that the Roman Pontiff was not his successor in the primacy, let him be anathema.
16. If any man say that the Roman Pontiff has only a right of supervision or direction over the Universal Church, and not a full and supreme power of jurisdiction, or that his power over the Churches, taken separately, is not immediate and ordinary, let him be anathema.
17. If any man say that the power of the Church is not compatible with that of supreme civil power, let him be anathema.
18. If any man say that the power necessary to rule civil society is not from God, let him be anathema.
19. If any man say that all rights among men and all authority are derived from the State, let him be anathema.
20. If any man say that the supreme rule of conscience lies in the law of the State, or in public opinion, and that the judicial power of the Church does not extend to pronouncing them legitimate or illegitimate, or that by civil law that can become legitimate which by divine law is illegitimate, let him be anathema.
21. If any man say that the laws of the Church have not binding force unless confirmed by the civil power, and that it is competent to the civil

power to judge or decree in causes where religion is implicated, let him be anathema.

The logical succession of ideas was manifest. The first five Canons established the principle that the Christian Church is a society which has Form, Visibility, Unity, and is necessary to salvation. The next series pronounced this Church to be Intolerant (6), Infallible (7), Final as a dispensation (8), Infallible in matters not contained in revelation (9), a Perfect Society not subject to the civil power (10), ruling by bishops (11), and possessing legislative, judicial, and compulsory power (12), because none can be saved out of her (13). The fourteenth Canon, and the two following ones, establish the unlimited dominion of the Pope over all bishops; while the eleventh establishes the ruling power of bishops, but leaves the sphere of it undefined, not even saying that it is over the Church. And this undefined ruling power of bishops is placed between the independence of the Church in relation to the civil power on the one hand, and her own compulsory power and the absolute authority of the Pope over the bishops on the other.

The seventeenth Canon affirms that the power of the Church is compatible with civil authority,—which without a doubt it is, so long as the civil authority abides within the limits traced for it by the Church. That authority may also, in the sense of Rome, be, in its order, supreme,—that is, not subject to any other civil authority, but always subject to the Pope, who is an authority of a higher order than the civil. The eighteenth Canon bases all civil authority on divine right. This is capable of more than one interpretation. First, it may mean that all existing authority is to be viewed as from God, whether it originated in conquest, prescription, or vote; or, secondly, it may mean that no civil authority is legitimate which has not divine sanction; and as among the baptised that sanction cannot be received except through the Pope, the consequence of such an interpretation would be obvious. The nineteenth Canon deliberately confounds natural and legal rights, as if the laws that

create and protect legal rights were not themselves the out-growth of natural rights. In the same way it confounds natural authority and legal authority. The twentieth seems to put civil law and mere public opinion on the same level, and places both one and the other under the judgment of the Church, and that as to their legitimacy or illegitimacy. *Judgment*, of course, does not mean criticism, instruction, remonstrance, or warning. It means what the word would mean anywhere, in such solemn legislative language, namely, judicial sentence. *Legitimacy* or *illegitimacy*, again, does not mean wisdom or folly, goodness or badness, but means what it says. Divine law includes Church law, and what it forbids no civil law can warrant. Therefore the power claimed in this fundamental proposition is that with which we are already acquainted in the literature of the movement for reconstruction, that, namely, of declaring what laws of a particular State are or are not legitimate; every such State being considered as a province of the universal theocratic monarchy.

Perhaps no principle embodied in these Canons lies so deep under the whole movement against free government in religious and civil society as the principle that confounds civil rights with natural ones, and, by denying that the State is the source of all rights, covers the denial of the fact that it is the source of legal rights. As to legal rights, we, sitting free and thankful amid our books, our friends, and our blessings, no more know of any source of such rights except that benign ordinance of our Father in heaven, the civil law, than did the teacher of Plato when by law deprived of his natural rights, he sat in his cell while the deadly cup was being prepared.¹ No, the State is not the author of rights, but it is the guardian of them. A State presupposes many families, and each family again involves the existence of authority, of rights, and of some kind of order. But, as between several families, must grow up a central judgment-seat, tribal, municipal, or national, according to the stage of development. Practically all our natural rights are

¹ Compare the *Origo* and the *Phædo*.

but a common for any beast to trample and to browse upon till the State surrounds them with the sacred fence of law ; then do they turn into garden sward, and well-watched flowers and fruits exceeding fair. But these principles, which strip the State of all moral mission, which empty law of all moral character, which rob society itself, and all the institutions of society, of any aim moral and eternal, of any but a temporary, material end, and which transfer all that is noble to the priesthood alone, cover one of the darkest attempts that art could direct against all the foundations of public life. The moral mission of the State is written on every page of the Bible, and the political mission of Christian priests not on a single one.

The State, in renouncing for itself the right to dictate to men their faith and worship, does not empty itself of a moral character, but, on the contrary, takes the highest possible moral ground. In that renunciation it does not disavow the faith and fear of God, but, on the contrary, avows its persuasion that the rights which affect the conscience of His creatures are so sacred as not to be sufficiently guarded except in His hand alone. Of shallow pretexts for oppression, none was ever shallower than the assumption that because society as such says that it dares not to come between God and the soul, therefore does it say that as society it has nothing to do with God.

The Court was evidently not disposed to leave politicians under any delusion. The *Civiltà* wrote on the politicasters and the Council,¹ as if to make statesmen feel that they had either to submit or else to bear the brunt of the revolutionary forces, from below and from above. A principal object of the Council, says the article, had avowedly been ‘the restoration of peace in the orders, even the political ones, of Christendom.’ This seemingly obscure language was really clear. The axiom is that peace rests on order ; and peace between the orders rests on the highest of all order, that is, on the subordination of every co-ordinate order to its immediate

¹ Serie VII., ix., 257 ff.

21 Jan 7

How Church Law annuls Civil Law. 189

superior up to the supreme one. The restoration of peace, therefore, presupposed the restoration of order, and especially of order among the orders. If Crown, Lords, and Commons were disputing as to their respective jurisdiction, peace would be impossible. Confessing that statesmen, or *politicasters*, as it called them, evinced anxiety, the *Civiltá* named measures to which they might be tempted to resort. These were two-fold which we shall call three-fold:—first, making new preventive laws; secondly, restoring obsolete ones; thirdly, separating the Church and the State. By preventive laws must be understood any legal bar set up to impede the Pope in any exercise of his legislative, judicial, or coercive power in a given realm. Preventive laws, old or new, it pronounces to be weapons which would infallibly ‘burst or break in the hands of governments, if they attempted to use them.’

The method by which this result would be brought about is indicated in a way which shows how *divine* law can loose what civil law binds.

‘There are two cases in which a subordinate is not obliged to obey a superior; the first, when a contrary precept exists of greater authority; the second, when the superior gives commands in things in respect of which the subordinate is not placed under him. . . . An inferior authority is not to be disobeyed where a superior one prohibits. Now, the authority of the Church, assembled in Council, is superior to the authority of the State. . . . It is superior in the sense in which the reasoning faculty in man is superior to the sentient and vegetative faculties. . . . Since the ecclesiastical authority is superior to the civil in such wise that, in matters affecting both, the acts of the civil must be subject to those of the ecclesiastical, it is manifest that if a collision arose between the definitions of the OEcumenical Council and the laws of the State, the latter would cease, by that fact alone, to have any binding force whatever.

‘The same conclusion may be deduced from the words in which the divine Founder of the Church gave authority to His disciples to teach His doctrine to all nations. *All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Go and teach all nations.* From the fact that, in virtue of His divine generation, the Father had conferred on Him all power, celestial and terrestrial, Christ argued thus, Therefore, go ye and teach all nations my doctrine; and thus He clearly demonstrated that His Church was invested by Him with *such a right of teaching that it would never be lawful for any power to offer to her opposition.* Therefore, should the State

require obedience to laws contrary to the definitions of the Council, it would do so without a true legal right. And if, notwithstanding, it employed force to procure obedience, it would fall into tyranny, odious to the conscience and ruinous to itself. . . . By no means does the authority of governments extend to commanding what the Ecumenical Council may prohibit, or to prohibiting what it may command ; and if governments should arrogate to themselves the right of doing so, in vain would they presume upon being able to oblige Catholic subjects to submit ; and should they have recourse to force, they would plunge themselves into tyranny which would not long serve the interests of those who displayed it.'

The principles are very simple and firmly fixed. While submission to *legitimate* authority is a duty, resistance to 'tyranny' is a right. Any authority used in contravention of the decrees of the Church ceases to be legitimate, runs into tyranny, and is to be disobeyed. Hence the duty of obedience to civil rulers is taught in the term '*due* obedience,' and only the Pope can judge when obedience ceases to be due ; but it is judged already that due it never can be, in any possible case, wherein the civil law contravenes the directions of the ecclesiastical authority. How States which profess to accept the corporation which insists on these principles as a true and worthy teacher, or which look on it as anything but an erring and dangerous caste, are to escape dissolution, it is not easy to see.

It is not hard to call the hopes of victory in the impending struggle monkish dreams, nor easy to dispel the show of probability in the following argument. Hundreds of examples in the past, where persistent ecclesiastical agitation triumphed over political instability, would rise up to the memory of well-read Jesuits, as making their calculations seem like those of positive philosophers, and the hopes of journalists and members of Parliament like those of enthusiasts, in the sense of men who look for ends without using means.

'What would such laws come to in case they were enacted ? They would come to be laws of no validity and no effect in what touches belief : of no validity because essentially null as to binding force ; of no effect because unable to prevent Catholics from a full adhesion of mind and heart to the dogmatic definitions of the Church. And as to external acts and matters of discipline, such laws would become a dead letter, or

2 Jan 4

a criminal oppression. A dead letter if the governments did not feel that they had nerve to put forth the strong hand and enforce the execution of them, in which case the laws would become *a ridiculous comedy*. Or a criminal oppression if, feeling themselves possessed of force, they should employ it to execute laws tyrannical, as being opposed to public liberty, public religion, and public faith.'

As to separating the Church from the State, the *Civiltá* proudly quotes the *Monde* of Paris :—

'The Catholics have number and force on their side . . . before apostatising the French government would think twice . . . the government surely would not give the signal for its own fall, and for a long revolution.'

The separation of Church and State is here spoken of evidently in the ordinary sense; but the charge of having already separated the State from the Church was one frequently brought against the government of France, when the language employed was that of the initiated. In that language the Draft of Decrees now under consideration described separation of the State from the Church as the denial of the right or duty of the State to coerce by the appointed penalties, except so far as may be demanded in the interests of public peace, those who violate the Catholic religion.¹

CHAPTER IX.

The Courts of Vienna and Paris manifest anxiety—Disturbances in Paris—Daru's Letters—Beust moves—His Despatches—His Passage of Arms with Antonelli—Daru's Despatch and Antonelli's Reply—Daru's Rejoinder—Beust lays down the Course which Austria will follow—Arnim's Despatch—The *Unitá* on the Situation—Veuillot on the Situation—Satisfaction of the Ultramontanes.

THE fire of small arms from the press only irritated the Curia; but presently the sound of heavy guns began to be heard, and ended in a boom, first from the Burg and next from

¹ Cap. XII., *Doc. ad. Ill.*, ii., p. 96.

the Tuileries. The two Emperors who, with the Pope, held a share in the sovereignty of Austria and France respectively, began to be aware of the fact that they might find themselves left by their senior partner exactly in the legal position which we have seen Phillips describe as that of the State in relation to the Church—the position in law of a married woman as compared with her husband. It will be remembered that, according to the doctrine of the *Civiltá*, every Catholic State must have two kings. It will also be remembered that in the State the bishops and the clergy, by right, stand to the national law in the same relation as do the ambassadors of a foreign power. It will further be remembered that all the Pope's subjects are bound to observe his law before that of the nation. If, therefore, the universal ruler could promulge what laws he pleased, and all these laws were to take the foreway of any competing laws of the State, it was plain that of the two kings in each State, the local one was at the mercy of the universal one.

On January 18th, the very day on which Gratry dated his famous letter, and on which, probably, Döllinger penned his protest dated one day later, Count Daru wrote a letter, of which the press got hold: 'They cannot be so blind,' said the Foreign Minister of France, 'as to suppose that it would be possible for us to keep our troops there a day after infallibility was proclaimed.' He hoped that the Holy Father would yield to the counsel of the most illustrious of the French bishops. A fortnight later (Feb. 5th), in a second letter, he expressed fears that the majority would take advantage of its powers, and said that he had caused Cardinal Antonelli to be apprised of the truth through M. de Banville; but he adds: 'It is clear that everything may be thrown into uncertainty by the conduct of the Italian, Spanish, and missionary bishops, who seem to live in a world apart.' He again speaks of the impossibility of keeping up a French garrison, and declares that the Propaganda seems to take no account of the Concordat, and that perhaps violence may be done to the pact which unites France

Jan 18

Disturbances Turned to Account. 193

with Rome. The revolutionary party, he affirms, is not only conspiring, but actually moving, and Rome must be blind to put weapons in their hands by breaking the force of the Conservatives, and compelling rebellion by the Syllabus.

This language betrays the weakness of statesmen who rely on Rome, as if it was a Conservative agency, but it would cause little anxiety to the Curia. They had forty thousand drilled men in France holding important places under the State. At this very time the movements of the revolutionary party in Paris were dwelt upon by Don Margotti in the tone of an enthusiastic bone-setter, who, hearing of accidents, felt sure that he must be called in. On February 11th the *Unità Cattolica* said that

Bonaparte had cause to fear barricades in Paris. He and his minister had been setting up barricades against the Council, and so the revolutionists were setting up barricades against him. The Church always conquered the barricades of Gallicanism, but Bonaparte may not conquer those of Paris. Some morning we may find that he has fled. The Emperor would have set his house in order in a better manner, if, instead of launching into the parliamentary system, he had declared from the day the Council was announced that he would submit himself and France in everything and for everything to its decision. . . . The very next day it is added: 'The troubles in Paris are a vengeance of divine justice on Napoleon for his misconduct in Italy. Had he not prevented the Pope from sending his cousin, Count Pepoli of Bologna, to the galleys, he would not have had to imprison Rochefort.'

If the same men who thus detested Napoleon threatened the Italians with French arms, it was simply from the belief that the Papacy had a stronger hold upon France than the empire. After saying (February 8th) that modern society is to the Church what the world was to Christ, and that the first Syllabus against the world was compiled by Christ, Don Margotti says on the next day to the Italians:—

'You will not go to Rome, because France will always oppose you; and she does so because, if she did not, the world would. If the free-thinkers do not believe in miracles, let them see one in this—that Rome will never be taken from the Pope. Even a government with Rochefort at its head would defend the temporal dominion of the Pope-king.'

There is a solemn passage in Vitelleschi where he speaks of the frequency with which governments find that they have to face some revolutionary movement at one and at the same time as that in which the claims of the Church are being pressed upon them. He does not pronounce that the two facts are in individual cases connected, but he does say that the frequent recurrence of the two simultaneously is 'an organic phenomenon worthy of the deepest attention' (p. 235). Rechtbaur in Vienna said, 'They threaten revolution if the State does not renounce its rights;' and a couple of days after it had quoted this remark, the *Unitá Cattolica* said:—

'Diocletian left a long tail behind him. His tail consists of those politicians who protest against the Syllabus as a declaration of war against modern society. Beust in Vienna, Hohenlohe in Munich, Ollivier in Paris, were not tranquil like the priest in Rome. Sooner or later they would all be engulfed in the stormy sea of revolution—all but the Church and the Pope. The Syllabus would abide for ever, and with it the Canons of the Vatican Council. . . . The Pope has proved by facts that he knows how to govern better than any other sovereign. We defy any emperor whatever to govern a country fourteen years as Pope Pius IX. has governed Rome.'

The letters of Count Daru, quoted above, caused inquiry in Rome. Quirinus asserted that the only existing copy of them was in the hands of the English government. It was known that Lord Acton was a near relation of the English Minister for Foreign Affairs. Putting this and that together, the Curia was inclined to say that Quirinus must be Lord Acton; and it is confidently affirmed that Monsignor Randi, whose spiritual duties were those of Director of Police, was taken into consultation with the Pope as to whether it would or would not be expedient to banish the suspected English nobleman.¹ The *Unitá* tried to make capital against Dupanloup out of these letters. It could not believe that the Bishop of Orleans would write to Daru and tell him what passed in the Council (March 8th).

¹ *Fromman* p. 91.

what year?

The anxiety felt at Courts in Catholic nations had now penetrated the mind of Count Beust. On February 10th he penned a remarkable despatch, in which he recited his pacific intentions and his innocent hopes, as indicated in his treatment of the Council hitherto, and especially in his rejection of the overtures of Bavaria. He was now, however, obliged to confess that, in Rome, there was a manifest determination not to acknowledge, nay, more, not to tolerate, that liberty which Austria claimed for the State in civil legislation. He now confesses to 'alarm,' and affirms that the Decrees of the Church 'would dig an impassable gulf between the laws of the Church and those which govern the greater part of modern societies.' Some of the proposed Canons 'would tend to paralyse civil legislation, and to destroy the respect which every citizen owes to the laws of his country, so that no State could be indifferent to the propagation of such doctrines.' He plainly declares that Austria would reserve to herself the right of interdicting the publication of any Act infringing the majesty of the law, and that every person who should disregard such prohibition must bear the legal consequences. He makes it perfectly plain that the law would recognise no difference between citizen and citizen, but that it would without exception be applied to all alike.¹ This despatch was followed by one to Berlin,² pointing out how delicate had been the position of Austria in the present transaction. It was a peculiar moment in the development of her national institutions. The empire was passing through an internal transformation. Hence arose a special necessity of maintaining the supremacy of law, and a corresponding expediency of avoiding internal conflict. There was an absolute call to check the passions which would be evoked should the course entered upon in Rome be persevered in. In addition to reasons of State for not identifying his policy with that of the minority of the bishops of the Council, Count Beust alleged that those

¹ Friedberg, p. 543 ff.

² Ibid., p. 547.

prelates found that any interference on the part of governments turned to an embarrassment for themselves, because they were accused of being the instruments of the political rulers, and he felt that it was not the bishops but the Cabinets that must defend the rights of States. A third despatch was directed to Munich.¹ In this, Count Beust intimated that Prince Hohenlohe might naturally think that it would have been better had the Count in time seen the force of his recommendations. Parrying this objection, he strongly urged united action, and stated that Austria was now ready to co-operate in a matter that evidently affected the common interests of all governments. The effect of all this was a formal visit of Count Trauttmansdorff, the Austrian ambassador, to Cardinal Antonelli. According to the report of the Count, the Cardinal had really nothing to say beyond the most commonplace evasions. The Decrees were still subject to discussion, and, on the other hand, interdicting the publication of Decrees in a certain country did not deprive them of their validity. Besides, he could not see how prohibiting the publication of the laws of the Church could be consistent with the policy which consisted in giving liberty to the publication of anything. Moreover, all the world knew that, while Rome affirmed principles, she would be very reasonable and gentle in the application of them, and none need to take the least alarm. Count Trauttmansdorff expresses his satisfaction with the attitude of the German bishops, but thinks that Austria has lost her influence by her recent changes of policy, and especially by her attacks upon the Concordat. He expects, on the contrary, great effect from the exercise of French influence.

The reply of Count Beust to this despatch was prompt and clear. True, he said, Decrees of the Church retain their validity though rejected by the government; but this was the very circumstance that showed the gravity of the position. It would become a serious matter, both for the Church and

¹ Friedberg, p. 549.

for Catholic governments, if laws which were valid for the one, were repudiated by the other. Again, as to the Cardinal's remark that refusing the Church liberty to promulge her laws was scarcely consistent with professions of giving liberty to publish anything, Count Beust thought that this remark could hardly be serious. 'Respect for the law is the basis of all liberty,' said the Count, 'and liberty which passes that boundary, becomes licence.' But this arrow would fall blunted from a conscience covered by the buckler of the Vatican. Any Vaticanist would simply say, Respect for a higher law is not disregard of law; and whenever Rome has spoken, her word is the higher law, respect for which is the real basis of order.

The reply of Antonelli to the despatch of Beust is a singular document. He is so generally credited with ability as a diplomatist that one would fear to say, even if one thought, that it is anything but an able paper, whether viewed in an intellectual or a diplomatic aspect. He states that the remonstrances of Beust were expressed in 'not very delicate terms,' and in weaker and much less courteous forms puts forward the arguments which we shall presently find employed in his reply to Daru. So far from accepting the reproach of want of delicacy, Beust instantly and formally repelled it, and said that the Pope's Nuncio, when appealed to, could hardly find an expression in his despatch on which to attempt to sustain the allegation of the Cardinal. He demanded a copy of the despatch, and, as soon as he had obtained it, instructed the ambassador at Rome to thank Antonelli for granting it, and to tell him that he had immediately laid it before the Emperor.¹ Whether the Emperor thought the despatch respectful to a power such as his we cannot say. Antonelli had the *maladresse* to put first and foremost among the manifestations on the part of the Curia which had caused disquietude to Cabinets, the publication in the *Augsburg Gazette* of the Canons. He did not see that it was only the Vatican

¹ Friedberg, p. 563.

that was disturbed by the publication, and that the governments were disturbed by the secrecy in which such a legislative attack upon their rights had been prepared. The governments would have been content with publicity without the Canons, while the Vatican, on its part, wanted nothing to content it but Canons enough without publicity, till its own time arrived.

The day after that on which Count Trauttmansdorff reported his interview with Cardinal Antonelli, Count Daru, in Paris, despatched an important document to the Vatican. According to an analysis of it, contained in the reply of Antonelli,¹ the Count summed up the effect of the Canons in two propositions. First, the infallibility of the Church extends, not only to the deposit of faith, but also to all that is necessary to its preservation. Secondly, the Church is a divine and perfect society, and exercises its power in two tribunals, the interior and the exterior. She is absolute in the domain of legislation, judicial procedure, and coercive force; and moreover exercises her power with full liberty, and in independence of any civil power whatever. The Count points out that the claims of the Church are now extended to authority over history, philosophy, and science, and involve an absolute subordination to the authority of the Church of the very principles of a national constitution, the rights and duties of governments, with the political rights and duties of citizens, both electoral and municipal. They are extended even to everything included in judicature and in legislation, in respect both of persons and things; to the rules of public administration, to the rights and duties of corporations, and in general to all the rights of the State, not excepting the right of conquest, and that of peace and war. Is it to be imagined, asks Count Daru, that princes will bow their sovereignty before the supremacy of the Court of Rome? Considering the protection granted by France to the Holy See for twenty years past, she has special duties before the world, and he, therefore, claims that projects of laws which are to be laid before the Council shall be communi-

¹ Friedberg, p. 533.

cated to the French government, and that time shall be allowed to forward the observations that may be deemed desirable before they are pressed for decision.

The reply of Antonelli to Daru has been generally looked upon as one of the ablest specimens of his skill. Unless at the moment the greatest daring was the greatest skill, we must think the impression of skill is made chiefly on the minds of those who have not carefully studied the Vatican dialect. It would seem that Count Daru, or his advisers, were perfectly aware of the meaning of the document; and to any one who was so, a more absolute statement of Papal suzerainty can scarcely be conceived. The technical term 'direct' plays an important part in the various assertions. In construing those assertions everything depends on the meaning of that term. The Cardinal does not deny the extension of the Papal authority to any one of the matters pointed out by Daru. He never denies that that authority is absolute, but always takes care to couple with the word 'absolute' the word 'direct'—it is not 'direct and absolute'; and the real meaning of much of the despatch would be brought out by the simple question, which any ecclesiastical adviser of the French Foreign Office *who was true to the government* would ask, Is it indirect and absolute? Moreover, the blank statement that the kingly power depends upon the priestly, is, in the form in which Antonelli puts it, an extension even of the ordinary Jesuit doctrine, which couples the dependence of the kingly power upon the priestly with several qualifications, practically not amounting to much, but theoretically necessary to be kept in view, because they enable men to seem to deny what they mean to maintain. Commencing by a complimentary paragraph as to the protection of France and the gratitude of the Pope, Antonelli goes on to express great surprise that the Canons should cause so much uneasiness. They only expressed the maxims and fundamental principles of the Church, published in all forms, taught in the schools, maintained for ages, and often approved of even by civil govern-

ments. Then follows a passage the effect of which would depend on the sense of the term 'direct.' The Decrees, says the Cardinal, do not ascribe to the Church, or to the Pontiff, a direct and absolute power over political rights, and the subordination of the civil to the ecclesiastical power is not to be understood in the sense of the despatch, but in another order. Daru apparently had made no distinction between direct and indirect, or between the natural order and the spiritual order. Speaking the ordinary language of men, by subordination he meant subordination, and by power he meant power. The Church, continues Antonelli, never claims to exercise a 'direct and absolute' power over the political rights of the State. Having received the mission to lead men, whether as individuals or as constituted into societies, to a supernatural end, the Church had received the corresponding authority to judge the morality of all acts interior or exterior, in respect of their conformity to laws natural and *divine*. 'As no action, whether commanded by a supreme power or freely performed by a person, can be divested of a quality of morality or justice, it follows that the judgment of the Church, though directly turning upon the morality of actions, indirectly extends to *all matters with which morality is connected*.' But this is not the same as direct interference in political affairs, which, by the order established by God, and by the teaching indeed of the Church, belong to the temporal power without any dependence on any authority. The subordination of the civil power to the religious one is in the sense¹ of the superiority of the priesthood. Hence the authority of sovereignty depends on that of priesthood, as human things depend on divine, and temporal on spiritual. And if temporal felicity, which is the end of civil power, is subordinate to eternal felicity, which is the spiritual end of the priesthood, it follows that to attain the end towards which God would have them

¹ The expression is peculiar. It is, *È nel senso della preccellenza del Sacerdozio sull' Impero* a motivo della superiorità del fine dell' uno sopra quello dell' altro ; quindi l'autorità dell' Impero da quella del Sacerdozio dipende, come le cose umane dalle divine, le temporali dalle spirituali.

respectively tend, the one power is subordinate to the other; and thus, as between them, there exists in one of the two a subordination of functions as there exists a subordination of ends.

Therefore, proceeds the despatch, if infallibility does extend to all that is necessary to conserve the faith, no prejudice will, on that account, arise to science, history, or politics. Of course (we may interject) the reasoning is, that any subordination arising from a divinely-appointed order cannot be the cause of prejudice, but only of advantage. Infallibility, he proceeds, has been exercised in times past, and princes have had no occasion to disquiet themselves. If the Church has been constituted by her divine founder a true and perfect Society, distinct from the civil power and independent of it, with a plenary three-fold authority, legislative, judicial, and coercive, no confusion will arise in the movements of human society, or in the exercise of the rights of the two powers. The jurisdiction of the one and of the other being clearly distinct and determinate, corresponding with the respective ends to which they are respectively directed, the Church does not exercise, in virtue of her authority, 'a direct and absolute' interference in the principles and constitutions, in the forms of civil power, in the political rights of citizens, in the duties of the State, and in the other matters enumerated in the despatch of the minister.

Almost the only thing not clear in the remarkable State paper in which Daru replied to this despatch,¹ is the way in which he understood the last remarks we have quoted from the Cardinal. He speaks of them as being important, but in what sense? As showing a wish to allay the impressions made by the Draft of Decrees, which is all the Cardinal really professes? or as containing any statement properly calculated to allay those apprehensions? Count Daru had evidently not read hastily, and had not been without clear-headed interpreters. He could not, for a moment, think that Antonelli had said that the Church had no authority to interfere in political matters,

¹ Friedberg, 588 ff.

when he really had said no more than that she did not *exercise* a 'direct and absolute' interference, by virtue of her authority. No more could Count Daru suppose that saying that she did not do so was a promise that she would not do so, although, even had such a promise been made, couched in the terms employed by Antonelli, the word 'direct' would have deprived it of any practical value. Every other portion of Count Daru's Memorandum must have made the Pope, to whom it was submitted, feel that the Minister of France understood the intentions of the Vatican. In this case, even M. Veuillot would not charge the statesman with handling the affairs without understanding the ideas.

'The more one examines the doctrine of this document, the more impossible does it become to overlook the fact that, in the main, it amounts to the complete subordination of civil power to the religious society. . . . Unless we refuse to words their true and natural meaning, we cannot escape the conviction that the Draft Decree on the Church has, for its object and end, the re-establishment, in the entire world, of doctrines which would place civil society under the empire of the clergy. . . . Under the formidable sanction of the anathema, the infallibility and authority of the Church are to be extended, not only to truths handed down by revelation, but to all things that may appear necessary for preserving the deposit of tradition. In other words, her infallibility and authority have no other limits than those which the Church may herself assign to them; and all principles of civil order, politics, and science, fall, directly or indirectly, within their range. It is on this almost boundless field that the Church is to exert the right of pronouncing decisions and promulgating laws, binding the conscience of the faithful, independently of any confirmation on the part of the political authority, and even in direct opposition to laws emanating from it. It is on this domain, the bounds of which, it appears, the Church alone may fix, that the Canons ascribe to her a complete power, which is at once legislative, judicial, and coercive, and is to be put forth in the external tribunal as well as in the internal,—a power the exercise of which the Church may assure by material penalties, and Christian princes and governments would be bound to lend their assistance by chastising all who should attempt to withdraw themselves from under her authority.'

No wonder that Count Daru draws the inference that 'governments would retain no power, and civil society would

retain no liberty, but the power and the liberty which it might please the Church to leave to them.' The dearest rights of States, their political constitution, their legislation on property, on the family, and on instruction, 'might any day be called in question by the ecclesiastical authority.' Moreover, it is now proposed that to all this shall be added Papal infallibility. '*That is to say, after having concentrated all political and religious powers in the hand of the Church, they will concentrate all the power of the Church in the hand of her head.*'

As to the artifice, that only principles were to be carried, but that the application of them would not be enforced, Daru says, No such statement suffices to reassure us. What, he asks, are people in the forty thousand parishes of France to be taught that they are free to do that which they are not free to believe? He will not even treat this representation as grave. He gives the Church credit for intending a serious work, and, therefore, when once she has inscribed a maxim among the immutable truths, she will try to bring it into practice. The Pontiff has not assembled the bishops of the whole world to promulgate sterile laws.

Antonelli had alleged that the principles in dispute were not new. That, replied Count Daru, he knew too well, but kings and nations had never accepted those principles, and the attempt to establish them had always, even in the middle ages, caused bloody conflict. Daru held that, in the present condition of society, Decrees such as those now put forward would be a dead letter. His fear was not for the interests of the State, but that an antagonism would be set up between civil society and the Church, which would be equally redoubtable for both. Public opinion, he declared, was aroused, and was expressing itself in a manner not to be misunderstood, and the government spoke as interpreting it. He concluded by declaring that if the propositions were adopted, they would have the inevitable consequence of bringing about grievous troubles.

The French government declared its intention of demanding that a special ambassador should be admitted to the Council. This Don Margotti hailed, first as a victory of the Council, and then as one of the most splendid victories of Pius IX. The ground of this professed exultation was that abstinence from the Council meant the separation of Church and State. ‘The Lord be praised, who is preparing greater triumphs for His spouse!’ France trembles for her revolution and her Gallicanism.¹ So can voice and face be changed in a moment.

Beust, in further despatches, declined any proposal for sending ambassadors to the Council, on the ground that governments would, by such an act, make themselves, in some sort, parties to its proceedings. He had laid down and firmly adhered to the principle of abiding within the line of purely political action. That principle, he declared, fully covered the two steps of interdicting all publications exciting to contempt of the law, and punishing all persons guilty of any contempt of it.² But he instructed Count Trauttmansdorff to support the French with all cordiality, in the demand that matters touching political interests, which were submitted to the Council, should be communicated to France before being enacted. But, on the part of the State, he could not take up theological arguments or plead the interests of the Catholic Church. He would take his stand on the interests of the State only, and tell the Court of Rome that, if it provoked a conflict, Austria would not give way to its decisions. For similar reasons, he must abstain from identifying the government with the bishops of the minority. Approving and sympathising with their position, he nevertheless felt that they might come to change their ground, and accept what the government could not accept.

The French government applied, also, to the North German Confederation to support its representatives. Bismarck was deliberate but firm. On the 23rd April,³ Arnim sent in a

¹ *Unità*, March 8th and 9th.

² *Friedberg*, p. 557.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 567.

despatch, cordially supporting the claims put forward by Daru. He said, that the Decrees, so far from being any vague menace for the future, were rather calculated to revive, and surround with a new dogmatic sanction, certain pontifical Decrees sufficiently known, and constantly combated by civil society in every age, and of every nation. An earnest wish to shun a collision pervaded the despatch.

The impression made upon the Curia by these appeals may perhaps be better gathered from Don Margotti and M. Veillot than from Antonelli's despatches. On March 3rd the *Unità Cattolica* says, France and Austria have really remonstrated against the proposed definition of infallibility. They are afraid of the doctrine of Christ. If they would only adopt the Council and its doctrine, it would restore even their finances. 'Do make an experiment. You have tried a thousand constitutions in France and Austria: why should you disdain to try the true Catholic constitution?' Let those two countries faithfully proclaim the doctrine, accept and spread it among the people, 'and in less than a year you will confess that it is a great salvation for the French and Austrian empires.' This is followed by a letter from a professor of theology on the opportuneness of defining the dogma of the personal infallibility of the Pope. He contends first that it would

'give a blow to Liberalism, which is the doctrine of human infallibility; for representative assemblies claim a true infallibility, because the decrees of such assemblies are not reformable by the Church; but if a single man alone is declared infallible, they all, whether individually or collectively, become fallible, and must receive from him their rules in jurisprudence and legislation, and every institution or ordinance declared by the Pontiff not to be good is, without appeal, rejected as false and corrupt. Liberalism, wherever it prevails, converts rulers into tyrants and subjects into slaves! The spectacle of seven hundred bishops giving up all to the Pope will restore the idea of legitimate authority.'

Anticipating the *final* struggle against the Church, he says, 'It is of the utmost importance that the Church bind up her people in the firmest unity; for the battle will be sore, and she will escape only by divine intervention.' On March 4th, the

Unità says that the Council is assailed by traitors. The devil always has a foot in good things, but he has two in the Council. Satan entered into the deputies of Italy, then into the body of Prince Hohenlohe, then he passed on to Döllinger, to Père Hyacinth, and to Père Gratry. The devil had entered into the cabinets of Beust and Daru, and into the palace at Munich, where Döllinger had been admitted to the same honours as formerly had been granted to Lola Montez.

M. Veuillot¹ imagines a conversation between a Catholic and a Liberal Catholic, of which the following is a condensation. It shows the kind of information which was granted, and the kind of argument which was welcome, to the forty thousand educated men on whom largely depends the fate of all French governments which attempt to govern through them :—

‘The governments are displeased.— Why?— Because!— What of that?— You offend common sense. The cause is the dogma of infallibility.— But the Holy Spirit?— It was not the Holy Spirit that signed the petition for infallibility.— Did He sign the other?— The other is inspired by the highest wisdom.— So be it. Both call upon the Holy Spirit and He will come.— He will not come.— Why?— The Rules of the Council are bad, the Hall is defective, discussion is impossible, the Council is not free.— What? the Fathers can read, study, pray, speak, and the Council is not free!— No, discussion is physically impossible, and it is from the shock of discussion that light breaks out just as from the concussion of flints.— The Council has no need of that kind of light which fires powder.— The governments are up against infallibility.— Let them come down.— They’ll make you come down yourself.— Allow me, if you speak to me, upon my word of honour, I am not the Council; and if you speak to the Council, it will answer, as it always has done to good advisers of your sort.

‘I fear God, dear Abner.’

After this comes what with M. Veuillot’s readers passes for argument. In the present state of law in regard to religious liberty, governments have nothing to do with infallibility but to study the new situation which it will create, and to conform their conduct to it, as liberty requires of them.

¹ Vol. i., p. 239.

Either they will voluntarily respect liberty, or they will encounter its defenders and sustain the combat. The governments ought to know that Catholics mean not to give up anything of their right, and of the fulness of their life. Some of them may be ready for curtailment, but such curtail themselves. They are free to do so in this world, but they must give account to God. As to the Church, continues M. Veuillot, she manages her affairs as it suits her. She looks beyond governments, beyond generations. She sows for the future, she constructs for centuries. Although she desires not to put governments to inconvenience, *it must be allowed that her compassion and her complaisance towards these foreigners must have their limits.* She bears the heavy burden of freedom of worship, and she takes the light advantages of it.

Thus is the way prepared for once more presenting the Saviour of society:—

‘In the night full of appeals from the imperilled, a loud voice cries, To whom shall we go? On the waters a loud voice cries, Save us! It is the voice of humanity, which a sublime instinct lifts towards him who sheds light and peace. We are at the opportune hour, for we are at the hour of danger. Now there is a man on the earth who knows that hour of mercy, that hour of God.’

Further on we find the same sinister reference to disturbances as in Don Margotti (p. 246):—

‘A letter is talked of from one of our ministers, who, it would appear, says that the difficulty of the government is not in Paris but in Rome. While this letter of the statesman is being read in Rome, barricades are springing up under his feet in Paris, and barricades are difficulties. . . . The head of the Church is always a great statesman, and ends by solving the difficulty. When statesmen will go to school to the Pope they will do marvels; but the world must not look for that just yet.’

It is well known, says M. Veuillot, returning to the sore point of the hints thrown out by Daru about withdrawing the troops, that if Daru withdraws the French sentinel from the door of the Council, many sentinels would be withdrawn from other doors in France (vol. i., p. 328). No wonder that

Italians speak of the *Univers* and the *Rappel* as kindred, if hostile. Rochefort and Veuillot are the two poles of the same violent hatred of ordered liberties and moderated power.

CHAPTER X.

Personal Attack on Dupanloup—Attempts at a Compromise—Impossibility of now retreating—Daru Resigns—Ollivier's Policy—Feeling that the Proceedings must be Shortened—The Episode of the Patriarch of Babylon—Proposal for a New Catechism—Michaud on Changes in Catechism—The Rules revised—An Archbishop stopped—Protest of One Hundred Bishops—Movement of Sympathy with Döllinger—The Pope's Chat—Pope and M. de Falloux—Internal Struggle of Friedrich.

THE Villa Grazioli was one of the houses angrily pointed at by the zealots of infallibility. There resided Dupanloup, too much courted for the pride of those who thought that any man in Rome who opposed the Curia ought to be ostracised. We do not remember any public hint given to the police to watch the villa, such as the *Unità Cattolica* broadly gave as to the Palazzo Valentini, the residence of Cardinal Hohenlohe (February 26th). But the amiabilities of the 'good press' were not denied to the Villa Grazioli. Bishop Wicart, of Laval, wrote to his local organ, insisting that every word of his letter should be printed, and saying that the talk about Monsieur Dupanloup in the diocese of Laval must be put an end to. 'I declare, before God, and in readiness to appear at His judgment-seat, that I had rather die—fall dead on the spot—than follow the Bishop of Orleans in the course he is now taking.'¹

It was not to this attack exclusively that Dupanloup referred in a letter to the chapter of his cathedral :—

'The spectacle will have been exhibited of a bishop who had, during a life already long, given strong proofs of devotion to the Church and to the Papacy, becoming all at once the butt for insult and for those indig-

¹ *Friedberg*, p. 112.

nities against which you protest, because on a capital question he said what he believed, and still believes, to be for the true interests of religion and of the Papacy.'¹

Ebullitions like this were but a sample of the increasing irritation on both sides. The majority naturally wanted to have done with the strife, the result of which was already certain. Vitelleschi says that the Curia desired that the Council should be merely a great ceremony for the solemn fulfilment of a pre-arranged program (p. 76). They bitterly accused the minority of egging on the governments to oppose the Council, to menace the Church, to insult the Holy Father, or even to dictate to the Holy Ghost. Every objection to the new dogma was denounced as rebellion against the Pontiff, hostility to the Council, disloyalty to Peter, and so forth. Documents such as those of Beust and Daru were a complete reversal of all that was right. At the moment when Rome was 'officially taking the affairs of the world in hand,' it was insufferable for people representing provinces such as Austria or France, to attempt to control the mistress of the world. Strictly speaking, Beust and Daru did not represent those two provinces any more than Menabrea represented Italy. They represented only the carnal and inordinate jealousy of the supernatural order entertained by the natural order in those provinces. They must be made to learn the meaning of the commission, 'Teach all nations.'

The members of the minority, trained by Rome to rush to statesmen and importune them for everything that could serve the Church, now that they believed her to be drifting to a terrible peril, did as they had been accustomed to do. Personally they were stung by hard words, not only from the Pope, but from all officials down to small diocesan editors, emulous of Don Margotti and M. Veuillot. Even priests in their own dioceses were set against them. The bishops were not to be allowed the powers of an aristocracy any more than the ornamental class, called nobles, in the Papal States. The Pope directly raised

¹ Friedberg, p. 114.

priests and people against them. As a party, the minority were irritated by restraint, suspicion, manœuvres, affronts, offers, and even by *espionage*. Their one solace was, they felt, a vain one. They could indeed speak, but they could not really debate. Their one refuge was vainer still. They could draw up petitions, but they might as well address them to Julius Cæsar for any answer that was ever vouchsafed. The air was full of complaints of long speeches. Some proposed that no more should be read, some that no more should be delivered in any form ; but that they should be written, printed, and distributed among the Fathers. Some combined the two propositions, suggesting that only *they* should deliver speeches who could do so *extempore*, and that the others should print theirs for those who liked to read them. The *Unità Cattolica* hailed the proposal to have no more speeches ; it would shorten the Council.

Others, again, tried to form a third party, on the basis of some compromise which would satisfy the Court by giving it in substance all the concentration of power it wanted, and yet would save the minority from the difficulty of accepting Papal infallibility in express terms. Bishop Vitelleschi was named in connection with this attempt. They who made it did not fully realise either the political or the theological bearing of the points at issue. The whole conduct of future operations must depend on the ability of the central authority to act at any moment and in any place, without the remotest fear of hesitation or delay on the part of the instruments ; above all, without any possibility of that old bugbear, an appeal to a General Council, being raised up again. All must depend on the ability of the central power to put every subordinate, higher or lower, individual or corporate, at any moment, into a dilemma between instant obedience or the sin of rebellion against an unappealable sentence. The establishment of this power depended on the recognition of the Vicar of God with plenary authority, carrying on the divine government upon earth, not by any concession of a Council, or any warrant of Canons, but on the simple ground of his com-

mission as Vicegerent. The authority required could not be rested on any lower ground, and this ground could not admit of ambiguity.

The pretensions which Pius IX. had set up under the veil of secrecy now began, through publicity, to drag Rome on to her doom. She would not have dared, at first, to face governments with her present claims. She had silently spread them in her schools, had excited her fancy with the echoes of them coming back mysteriously from provincial synods and from episcopal thrones, had shaped them into formulæ, one part of which her fears had cast away, and another part of which publicity had put to shame. Some now asked her to stop when the coach was at full swing down hill! The attempt to do so would be attended with extreme danger. She would lose, not only the new authority at which she had been grasping, but also a considerable part of the old authority, out of which that was to have been developed.

The Canons which had been the occasion of the protest from governments could indeed well be spared, if the supreme authority and infallible judgment of the sovereign were proclaimed; but without that the Canons would be paper laws in the hand of a discredited administration. The Syllabus, cried M. Veillot, had lighted a torch, five years beforehand, by which to study the objects of the Council (vol. i., p. 55). The Curia had studied the objects during the five years by that light. For its retreat on the main point was now an absolute impossibility. Had France really withdrawn her troops, the Curia could have broken up the Council under the justification of physical fear, and so would have escaped the dilemma by an intervention of Providence. But it was not to be. And we may as well here slightly anticipate our narrative, in order to complete the incident of the French note. Daru was one of the ministers who resigned on finding out that the Emperor's professions of setting up a responsible ministry were such as to remind one of the *mot* attributed to Dupin, at the

very height of Louis Napoleon's power: 'It is really too bad: one cannot now believe even the opposite of what he says.'

It was reported in Rome that, within twenty-four hours, two telegrams had arrived from Paris. The first read: 'Decidedly Daru will not have infallibility. He announces that there will be a rupture.' The second read: 'Daru retires. Ollivier replaces him. The Council free.' If it is true, cried M. Veuillot, it is glorious for M. Ollivier (vol. i., p. 462). The despatch of Ollivier, on taking over the office of Foreign Affairs from Daru, would have been thought straightforward if proceeding from any Court but such a one as that of the Tuilleries then was. After stating that the Emperor had not sent an ambassador to the Council, and had scrupulously abstained from interfering with its proceedings, but that recently, when warned by the rumours in Europe of dangers menacing the cause of religion, he had for a moment stepped out of his reserve and offered counsel, Ollivier proceeds:—

'The Holy Father has not seen it right to listen to our counsels, nor to accept our observations. We do not insist, and we resume our attitude of reserve and expectation.'

'You will not seek or accept, henceforth, any conversation, either with the Pope or with Cardinal Antonelli, on the affairs of the Council.'

'You will confine yourself to gaining information, and keeping yourself acquainted with facts, with the sentiments which have prepared them, and with the impressions which have followed them.'¹

So terminated an incident that caused, for a time, a considerable flutter, and seems to have offered to the Curia the only fair escape from the dilemma into which it had got. It was now felt that the legislation necessary to put the new constitution into working order, must be pressed into as small a space of time as possible. The restoration of ideas had not advanced satisfactorily since the meeting of the Council, and the restoration of facts had made no progress at all. The

¹ Friedberg, p. 138.

voluminous Drafts had already brought Court theology into contempt. The expressions of this contempt were coming from various seats of learning, and were smiting the ears of the purpled very unpleasantly. The Drafts had also caused loss of time and prestige within the Council itself. The Rules, about which there was a never-ceasing murmur, by preventing real debate and allowing endless but desultory reading of papers, threatened to protract the proceedings beyond all bounds. If it is asked what had become of the Drafts, which had been discussed and for a time had disappeared, they were under revision by committees containing not a single man who had unfavourably criticised them, but containing the irresponsible persons who had drawn them up.

Friedrich had spent an evening and morning in writing to Lord Acton on the Papal system as developed in the Draft Decree on the Church, and in expressing his fears that the bishops would not see through it, when a piece of news reached him, which, though at ordinary times it would scarcely have been talked of in Rome, just then caused some excitement (p. 143). It was, as he relates, to the effect that Audu, Patriarch of Babylon, after having spoken in opposition to the Curia, had, as we have seen, been sent for at night by the Pope, who allowed no witness of the interview but Valerga, the so-called Patriarch of Jerusalem, who, however, as Vitelleschi says, was, previous to his elevation, simply a Roman ecclesiastic. Valerga acted as interpreter. The Pope raged, commanded the weak old man to resign his patriarchate, forced a pen into his hand, and ceased not storming till it was done. Then, to give practical effect to the resignation, two bishops, not chosen by Audu, were appointed, and he must consecrate them.¹ Such was the tale. Friedrich took it as a sample of infallibility in practice, even before the Council had sanctioned it in theory. In itself, the story would seem very improbable in London, but not at all so in Constantinople

¹ *Vitelleschi*, p. 81.

or Rome. In the latter city the reputation of Pius IX. is high for fits of rage, in which his best friends are treated like lackeys. Liverani, who over and over again calls him an angel, tells nevertheless several stories of conduct to those about him which, if they could be told of an English squire, would not get him the name of angel from his stewards and bailiffs. Even the all but adoring editor of the *Speeches* gives a specimen which evidently hammered a deep dint into his Neapolitan sensibilities. If the tales are true, the rage passes away, giving place to habitual jocoseness.

Vitelleschi says that an alternative was set before the Chaldean Patriarch—either he must submit to the Pope's authority as to certain appointments, or resign. Being reduced to this extremity by his imperious brother, the poor old man did resign, and the event 'created a great sensation.' To the Roman nobleman the scene presented no improbability. He does not even hint that it is a rare specimen of the tranquil waters which lie behind St. Peter's Rock. The noise made by the rumours forced even so great a person as M. Veuillot to take notice of them. His usual style of contradiction is very striking, and perhaps instructive. He will spend, it may be, pages in making somebody, who has said something, look extremely ridiculous; but, at the end, you wonder what he has contradicted. On the present occasion, however, M. Veuillot did stoop to particulars. With a moderate proportion of talk about revolting lies, and about people who are abandoned of God and have no refuge but the newspapers, he gives the *true* version of the tale,—so true that there could not be any other version. First, he says that the Patriarch had himself chosen two bishops, but after the Pope had approved of them, he refused to consecrate them. This is in direct contradiction of a statement, on the other side, that the Propaganda had chosen the two bishops in question, and that the Patriarch refused to consecrate them. The latter version gives a clear cause of dispute, whereas that of M. Veuillot leaves the re-

sistance of the Patriarch, as he himself says, inexplicable. But as to what took place, his account is this:—

'The Pope called the Patriarch into his cabinet, and told him to consecrate the two suffragans in twenty-four hours, or to sign his resignation. The Patriarch asked for a delay of three days, then of two days. The Pope was inflexible; he required that the Patriarch should forthwith sign the engagement to obey. The Patriarch took a pen, and began to write; but he stopped, saying that the pen would not go. The Pope presented him with a penknife. The Patriarch of Jerusalem, who acted as interpreter, mended the pen. The Chaldean Patriarch resisted no further. He wrote the engagement to consecrate the two bishops, or to abdicate in twenty-four hours, and pushed his precision so far as to affix the date—half-past seven in the evening. The next morning he performed the consecration.'

M. Veillot vehemently denies that the Pope was in a rage, or that he broke pens with his fist, or that he played the part of a tyrant. He seems to take it for granted that good Catholics ought to be edified with his own account of this rehearsal of a scene in the forthcoming drama of 'ordinary and immediate jurisdiction' in all dioceses of the world.

Three Patriarchs alone in one room! The one representing the city in which we know that Peter did live, the second representing that in which we have good reason to think he laboured and wrote, the third representing the city which has long built fabrics on the fable that he was its bishop for five-and-twenty years. Jerusalem, with Babylon of the Old Testament and Babylon of the New! poor Jerusalem, in the person of the Roman Valerga, is the tool; Babylon is the victim; and Babylon the Great is the tyrant. The old man from Chaldea, a land with a history behind it ancient in comparison with that of Rome, as the Euphrates is noble in comparison with the Tiber, could hardly have foreseen that in a very short time the story of Peter's reign of twenty-five years in Rome would be publicly tested in the city by a discussion.

We have hinted that Vitelleschi expresses no feeling of improbability as to the tale of the Chaldean Patriarch. On the contrary, he immediately follows it up by alluding to rumours

of proceedings contemplated by the Propaganda against certain bishops under its jurisdiction, who had manifested a want of docility in seconding its projects (p. 82). These rumours, he says, revived uncomfortable recollections of the Inquisition, adding that events of this nature are of common occurrence, and might happen a thousand times without attracting much notice. But the moment was exceptional.

The interest of the General Congregations, from the time when the movement for the definition of infallibility declared itself, centred in that impending question, and but faintly, and intermittently, swayed towards any other. The particular matter now on hand was a proposal to do away with the diocesan Catechisms throughout the world, and to adopt a uniform one for all. Outside the Church of Rome this would probably have seemed a natural point of uniformity, but, inside of it, the determination of the municipal *coterie* to drive rough-shod over all that was homely or ancient, all that was national or local, roused the spirit of opposition. It was clearly felt that taking away from the bishops the right of approving their own Catechisms was a further blow at their authority. For many years past, the Jesuits had been altering Catechisms, and so gradually naturalising the doctrine of infallibility on soil hostile to it, especially through schools conducted by nuns.¹ They had made the Catechism a great financial success. A new one for the whole world would be an estate for the Curia.

The book of the Abbé Michaud, *De la Falsification du Catéchisme*, is a curious study. He expresses the sum of his researches by saying that Catholicism has been replaced by Popery. The old Paris Catechism did not use the expression ‘the *Roman* Church.’ It always said, ‘the Catholic Church;’ and in some Catechisms, in France, the word ‘Roman’ first came in as late as 1839, and that only in a profession of faith at the end: ‘I acknowledge the Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church.’ Noting the progressive change in definitions of the

¹ *Quirinus*, p. 267.

1839
1825

Changes in the Catechism.

217

Church, Michaud gives examples, showing that the earliest do not even mention the Pope, and that the latest speak of nothing but the Pope (p. 23). The early Catechisms call Christ the Foundation of the Church; succeeding ones give this title to the Confession of St. Peter; next to the Apostles, then to Peter, and, finally, to the Pope; and some recent ones even say that the Church is founded on the Papacy (p. 34). The older Catechisms speak of the Head of the Church as Christ, and of the unity of the Church as being in and by Jesus Christ. But from 1825 the reply given to the question as to the Head of the Church is what Michaud calls insidious. The designation 'Head of the Church,' is gradually withdrawn from Christ, to be bestowed upon the Pope. One Catechism, as early as 1756, said that the visible Head of the Church, being subordinate to the Invisible One, made only one Head with Him. On the question of the seat of authority in the Church, a precisely similar process has taken place; and infallibility has followed in the same track. Formerly, says the Abbé, it was believed that the Pope had no authority or infallibility but through the Church. Now, it is declared that the Church has no authority or infallibility but through the Pope. We may remark that the terms of the Vatican Decrees do not go so far as the last assertion. The framers meant to do so, but their logic failed them, and they have left a dualism full of future perplexity. The Abbé shows that the Catechisms of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and many down to the year 1843, always speak of the infallibility of the Church. Later, the term, 'the infallibility of the Teaching Church,' is introduced. That means, of the Pope and the bishops. Michaud does not quote any with this terminology earlier than 1786. But that could not suffice for the Romanists. In 1834, the Amiens Catechism prepared for the transition by expressing the new doctrine so that the people would not understand it:—'All the faithful, without exception, owe respect and obedience to the Pope, in all that regards faith and morals.' The Abbé says

that, at the present time, not content with saying clearly what the Amiens Cathechism said obscurely, they teach, not only that the Pope is infallible, but that he is the source of infallibility. ‘As the Church was replaced by the Teaching Church, the Teaching Church has been replaced by the Pope.’ Thus, in the drift of tradition, all over the world, has Flint-Jack been busily sowing new relics of primeval antiquity. A religious and political system shifting in this fashion does not well bear even that kind of check which is afforded by the existence of different Catechisms in neighbouring dioceses. It was not quite so easy to teach at Rouen that the Pope singly is infallible, when at Paris the Catechism said that the Church was infallible, and at Cologne it said plainly that the Pope was not infallible. And the fact of this tendency to change doctrine downward, and further downward, was a reason for a feeling against one Catechism stronger than could be understood in any community with a fixed rule of faith.

The changes made in the application to the Church of the word ‘believe,’ are equally curious. The old form of words as to believing in one Catholic Church was first changed into believing in the Teaching Church. Then ‘respect and obedience to the Pope’ began to be inserted, from the end of the seventeenth century onward. In 1819 an Arras Catechism claimed ‘sovereign respect;’ but so far there is no mention of belief in decisions of the Pope. It was in 1834 that the Catechisms of Avignon and Amiens prepared for the transition from ‘respect’ to ‘belief,’ by teaching the necessity of inviolable attachment to all that the Pope teaches. The consummation so prepared for was not far off. The St. Brieuc Catechism of 1835, and that of the Abbé Guillois of 1851, taught that it is necessary and Catholic to believe in the Pope as well as in the Church.

The transition from ‘belief’ to ‘the faith’ is very easy. Originally, the *depôt* of the faith, which the Church had to guard, and to which no man could add, and from which no man could take away, was called The Doctrine of Christ. Then

it began to be called The Doctrine of the Apostles; later, The Doctrine of the Successors of the Apostles ; and, after that, The Doctrine of the Prince of the Successors of the Apostles ; and, finally, of course, The Doctrine of the Pope (p. 76). The new and uniform shorter Catechism (*De Parvo Catechismo*) was to be modelled on that of Bellarmine, others being consulted. No hint was given as to how it was to be prepared, and the bishops raised many doubts. Should it not be submitted to the Council ? Or, if that was not done, surely it would not be made obligatory, but only recommended. Others would have twelve bishops elected by the Council itself to prepare it. Some wished that, when prepared, three years should be given for the bishops to examine and test it ; and then that only after having been approved by them should it be made binding. None of these guards against centralisation found any favour.

The complaints about the Rules, and the desire of the majority for something to expedite business, were to produce some effect at last. When between two and three months had passed without a single one of the much-prepared Drafts being homologated, as the Scotch would say, by the Council, it was time to do something. The plan of shaping Rules for the Council without the bishops was resorted to once more. New Rules were given out as an edict, just as the original ones had been, and were headed *A Decree*, as if the Council itself had framed them. To allow the conclave to make rules for itself, or to amend those imposed upon it, would have been a dangerous approximation to ancient conciliar forms. It had become even clearer than had been foreseen, that a free Council would be a less docile instrument than the sort of Secret Consistory which had been so cleverly devised.

The statement of Vitelleschi, that the Rules provided for the printing of the speeches and their distribution among the Fathers, is not correct ; and his further statement, that they gave the Presidents the right of cutting short any speaker, is inexact. All they give is the ordinary right of calling a

speaker back to the question, *ad propositam quæstionem ipsum revocare*.¹ But it is a different question, whether the Presidents did not take this as containing the power of cutting a speaker short. Immediately after its promulgation, Haynald made a quotation to prove that a Pope had, at the time when the Breviary was being revised, expressed an opinion contrary to that now held by the majority, and the President immediately requested him, says Vitelleschi, to come down from the pulpit. That certainly is much more than calling him back to the question. Friedrich relates this scene as one in which signs of impatience, given both by voice and feet, were general among the majority, even Cardinals making demonstrations. So Cardinal Capalti seized the bell and called the speaker to the question. The Archbishop insisted that it was the duty of the majority to hear him ; but Capalti told him that they evidently would not hear him, and he must stop.²

La Liberté du Concile adds an important particular.³ Haynald had been attacked by a Belgian bishop for an opinion expressed by him in a speech. He immediately asked leave to reply ; and, in order to observe the Rules to the letter, he went to the *bureau* of the Presidents, and requested leave to speak on a personal point—the false interpretation put upon his speech. Leave was refused, but the Presidents told him that he could take the opportunity of explaining when he should speak in another debate. He waited for weeks. On the day now in question, before commencing to speak, he told the President that, after his speech, he meant to reply to the attack which had long before been made upon him. He was authorised to do so. But no sooner had he begun to present his personal defence, than the majority interrupted him with violent clamour. Instead of enforcing respect for the dignity of the Council and the liberty of speech, one of the Presidents cried to the speaker,

¹ Friedberg, p. 415; *Acta*, p. 18; Freiburg ed., p. 163.

² Friedrich, p. 198.

³ Doo. *ad III.*, i., 164.

'You see that they will not hear you.' And when Haynald represented that he had been authorised to defend himself, 'Hold your peace and come down' (*Taceas et descendas*), cried Cardinal Capalti, who thus took the place of Cardinal De Angelis, the Senior President.

It was on February 22nd that the new Rules were delivered, and on the 1st of March more than one hundred prelates, of all nations, sent in a solemn protest to the Presiding Cardinals. This was all they could do, short of leaving the Council. They begin by pointing out that the new Rules professed to preserve the liberty due to bishops of the Catholic Church ; but that, in most respects, it seemed as if their liberty was diminished by them, and even exposed to abolition.¹ The Rules said that, when new Drafts of Decrees were distributed, the Fathers were to send in their remarks and suggestions in writing, and the Presidents would allow a suitable time for so doing. The petitioners represent that this might do for ordinary matters, but when grave questions of dogma were to be discussed, the time allowed should be very ample, and the wishes of those who wanted an extension of it should be met.

The Rules said that, after the committee had considered such remarks and suggestions as might have been sent in, they should present the Draft to the Council amended, and with it a summary report containing a mention of the remarks and suggestions which had been made. The hundred bishops say that a mention is not enough. That would leave the committee free to omit what it pleased. The remarks and suggestions ought to be given at full, else the committee would become the entire Council, and, in most things, the only judge.² Moreover, the reasons assigned by authors of remarks and suggestions should also be given. They request, further, that authors of suggestions should have the right of explaining them, and, if need be, of defending them before the committee. The idea of a

¹ 'In pluribus Patrum libertas inde minui, imo etiam tolli posse videatur.'

² Alioquin jam deputatio cesset totum concilium et in pluribus solus iudex.

right of reply, which the original Rules had completely ignored, had been, after a fashion, introduced into the new ones. That is, the members of the committee were to have the right of reply, either at once or on a later day, to any one speaker, or to a number of them. The hundred bishops do not challenge this immense power granted to the committee, but they demand that the speaker so replied to shall have his right of rejoinder.

The hundred strongly reclaim against a provision for closing a discussion by a rising and sitting vote. This, they say, is a mode of voting unknown in Councils, and is liable to haste, to error, and to the contagion of momentary feeling. It might be quite allowable in parliamentary proceedings, where a thing done this year may be undone the next. But it is not admissible in a case where the matters in hand are so awful and irrevocable as Decrees, which once adopted are never to be amended or discussed again. They demand that no question should be closed so long as any one who had not spoken claimed his right to do so as a witness and a judge of the faith. They demand also that speakers should be heard alternately, one for and one against any proposal under consideration ; and, moreover, in matters affecting the faith, that no discussion should be closed so long as fifty Fathers objected. They strongly urge that, in a General Council, neither precedent nor propriety requires that many Decrees rashly adopted shall be preferred to a few thoroughly sifted.

They then come to the solemn point, as to how many votes suffice to make a dogma ? The new Rules did not require a majority of two-thirds, as many political constitutions provide in a case of importance. They left the decision open to a simple majority. This the hundred bishops treat as a total and astounding novelty. In General Councils, moral unanimity in matters of dogma had been the rule. It was a rule accepted, and avowedly acted upon, at Trent, by Pius IV. No other rule would be consistent with the principle of Vincent

of Lerins, ‘What has been believed always, everywhere, and by all.’ Catholic dogmas being formed by consent of the Churches, it followed that they could not be defined in a Council except by the consent, morally unanimous, of the bishops who represent those Churches. They assert that this condition is the pivot on which the whole Council turns. This condition, they proceed to say, seems to be the more urgent in the Vatican Council, because so many Fathers were admitted to vote, as to whom it was not clear whether they held their title to do so by ecclesiastical or by divine right.

Thus indicating the fact that, first, a majority had been made up largely of men who represented nothing, and that now that majority was to be used to change, not only the dogmas of the Church, but the very source and criterion of dogma, they proceed to a sorrowful declaration, that unless the point as to the numbers voting was conceded, their consciences would be burdened with an intolerable weight. They should have fears that the oecumenical character of the Council would be called in question; that a handle would be given to enemies for attacks on the Holy See and on the Council; and that thus the authority of the Council would be undermined among the Christian people, as though it had been lacking in truth and liberty; and in these troublous times that would be a calamity so great that a worse could not be imagined.¹

‘Thus,’ cries *La Liberté du Concile*, ‘you have a hundred bishops who say, Oppression is couched in these Rules. We have liberty indeed, but liberty restrained, garrotted; which can be choked whenever they like. *Imo etiam tolli posse videatur.* They say more. They say that these Rules contain a grave menace, a flagrant violation of Catholic tradition, an intolerable oppression of their conscience, pregnant with the greatest perils for the future, capable of striking the Council to the heart and of inducing incalculable misfortunes. That is said by one hundred bishops.’

The foundation formed by such a rule of faith as the consent of the Churches seemed solid as long as streams were shut off,

¹ *Documenta*, i., p. 263. Here *veritas* seems to mean reality ‘quasi veritate et libertate caruerit.

but now that the waters were rising the bishops began to feel symptoms of a shaking. They did not, however, yet know that one rush from a sluice, to be suddenly opened by the Pope himself, was, ere they rose, to bear that sand clean away, and to drop them down on to a rotten rock of Roman infallibility. Even the consent of the Church was to be dispensed with.

In the meantime, learned bodies in Germany had hastened to support Döllinger. Public addresses came to him from the universities of Bonn, Prague, and Breslau, and from colleges in other places, bearing the best names of German Catholics in letters and science. The towns, emulating the colleges, joined in the movement; Cologne, Kempten, Freiburg-in-Brisgau, and other places sending in addresses. Munich voted to the venerable scholar an honorary citizenship, which he modestly declined. It was evident that the German people would have followed in large numbers in the movement thus begun, but the bishops who, in Rome, seemed to be earnest in opposing the Curia, suppressed all attempts to discourage it on the part of their clergy or people. They had woven a tangled web at Fulda, and were getting deeper and deeper into its meshes. On the other side, the Pope, the Curia, and the Infallibilist bishops did everything possible to bring pressure to bear upon the bishops of the Opposition, both from the clergy and from the people. As with Hildebrand, so now, all authority which did not move at the beck of 'Peter,' was overturned or overmatched by raising subordinates at the call of the higher power. Döllinger had said, in reply to an address, that he had done no more than maintain views in which, as to the substance, he was at one with the majority of the German prelates. This was in Rome skilfully turned into a reason for demands upon those prelates. Signor Aloysi, evidently by commission of the Pope, proposed to the Archbishop of Munich to disavow Döllinger, and to procure a collective disavowal from the German bishops. This the Archbishop declined to do.

It is hardly fair to conclude that the German bishops made a show of opposition merely to be able to say to the people, We resisted till the word was spoken, as you did ; but now that it is spoken, we submit, and so must you. In addition to calculations of this kind, there was probably a consciousness that a mortal struggle was rising between Rome and all the religion, freedom, and light in the outside world, and that it would go hard with Rome. The only possible counterpoise to their fear of the Pope would have been a movement on the part of governments to separate the Church from the State. But the politicians were as little prepared for that as the bishops were for schism. So, both the one and the other, however involuntarily, concurred in helping Rome on towards the catastrophe. Ketteler proposed that the German bishops should disavow Döllinger, but could not carry his point.¹ He disavowed him on his own account. Senestrey forbade theological students of his diocese to attend the classes of Döllinger ; but Scherr, Archbishop of Munich, refused to do even this. The press, however, made amends for the slackness of the Ordinary. M. Veuillot told how Döllinger's father had said that the devil of a boy had two heads and no heart, and how, in his Cathedral stall, he did not know how to handle his breviary, and sometimes read, instead of it, proofs of his books. Quirinus might, indeed, say, ' It is no longer possible to conceal by any periphrasis the fact that the spirit the Opposition has to combat is no other than the spirit of lying ' (p. 260). But the writers of the Curia charged upon all Opposition writers, not only hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness, but especially lying, with the loving and making of lies.

The Pope, whose jokes and outbursts alternately supplied gossip, is reported by Friedrich as saying that Döllinger was a heretic, or very near it, and that Gunther was much more respectable, as he had been quiet for a long time (dead). Some one observing to him that Döllinger was a harmless

¹ *Quirinus*, p. 261.

old man, he replied, Pretty kind of old man that receives addresses from every quarter. He made no secret that he took the Opposition bishops generally for 'softheads,' but thought they must have some one behind them. He knew who nodded approval while Strossmayer spoke, and who pressed his hand when he came down. He said that Cardinal Schwarzenberg played the part of the sub-deacon in the manger ; that is, the part of the ass in the scene of the Nativity. Schwarzenberg, he said, had been the only person who declared that the definition of the Immaculate Conception would draw bad consequences after it. But 'the definition took place on a morning when the sun shone so wonderfully that I recognised in it the confirmation of my design.' Much more chat of the same quality is given.

Friedrich has one short paragraph, to the effect that it was confidently asserted that Veuillot had a seat behind the scenes in the Council Hall. A man deeply initiated in the secrets of the Council did not deny it (p. 165). If this was the case, it would be curious to compare it with M. Veuillot's account of his being on the Pincio, instead of in the Cathedral, on the opening day. That meditation in the rain seemed rather eccentric.

The Pope had arranged for an exhibition of Catholic art, and opened it in person with a speech. The passage which made the greatest impression was that in which he alluded to a recent saying of M. de Falloux, a zealous French Catholic politician, and the actual author of the Education Bill which embodied Montalembert's policy, to the effect that the Church had never had her '89, and she needed one. The Pope declared, I say that is blasphemy. There were many versions of the utterance, but M. Veuillot, evidently by authority, stuck to this one. M. de Falloux, after a considerable time, wrote to Bishop Freppel saying that he had not used the phrase alleged. Bishop Freppel told the Pope that M. de Falloux wrote that he had not used it. The Pope replied that if M. de Falloux had

not used it, he had not condemned M. de Falloux. There the tale is left by Veuillot (i., p. 360).¹

A case like this indicates the struggles between old opinion and the new light of unforeseen circumstances, through which many must, at this time, have been passing. In the case of Hyacinth and Gratry, the struggle had come to the surface; in that of Döllinger, it put on the solemnity of age; in that of Montalembert, the awe of death. From the oratory at Birmingham to the chambers of the Quirinal, from under the roof of the Vatican to lone stations in some mission wild, were men moaning with a conscience-ache. The coming on of an eclipse could hardly be more awful to a meditative Magus than the advancing shadow of heresy on the Church herself to one who had believed her infallible. The dread images of doubt and uncertainty not only haunted, but threatened many a brave spirit. If the infallibility of the Church was to be reduced to the level of that of the Popes, in the doctrines and morals they had solemnly taught; to the level, for instance, of Pius IX. and his *Syllabus*,—alas, alas for the great ideas of the past! And was it so clear that it had been innocent to lay those under anathema who, looking away from man to Christ, from Councils to the Bible, had meekly said, The only infallible guide over life's broad sea is not the church steeples, but the stars.

The veil is partly lifted off from one such struggle. Friedrich's stay in Rome had been harassing. Suspected of being the correspondent of the *Augsburg Gazette*, he had been denounced in the papers, treated rudely by bishops, jeered at by the Pope, reported as being banished, and dogged by police spies even in the house of Cardinal Hohenlohe. All this would intensify his perception of the moral corruption of the city, of which many a priest before him had spoken,

¹ Strangely enough, in April 1876, the papers spoke of the excitement caused in France by the fact that Bishop Freppel had positively excommunicated the zealous M. de Falloux for some breach of the ecclesiastical law, in a matter connected with Church property.

from Luther to Liverani, or Lamménais. It would also give a keener edge to the theological debates which were going on in his own mind. After an interval of five days in his diary, he writes under date of February 25th (p. 195):—

‘At last I must once more take up the pen. If the last few days have been important for the history of the Council, still more important have they been for my own life-history. A mental struggle within me has reached its close, one which was hard to undergo, and which shook my entire mental and physical being. Now all stands clear before my eyes. I know the end toward which I am to steer. The Lord has once more led me a stage further in my life-path. It was truly a melancholy thought for me when, finding for a moment a point of rest in the midst of this struggle, I looked back upon my peculiar course. From that decision to become a Jesuit, onwards to this journey to Rome, an unseen hand has so perceptibly led me, almost always without design of mine, that even here, in the midst of the new storms, I have been able to take fresh courage. I stand here in Rome only through the unseen guidance of the Lord ; for it was not I that ever took a step to come here ; indeed, all was done without me. But I see clearly that even that dispensation was to purify my views and intentions, and to lead me on towards the sole prescribed end of my life.

‘At one time, how much was Rome for me ! How did I, in a sense, worship all that came from it ! Now I see that here reign not only the most horrid ignorance, but, still more, pride, lies, and sin. Henceforth my life has its task marked out for two ends. Henceforth is it devoted to the struggle against the Curia (not primacy), and to that against the Jesuits. If I fall in it, I shall believe that the Lord has so willed, and that there can be, and that there is, a martyrdom for Christ, and for His Church, among the faithful. If I have had to learn here that the Curialists and the Jesuits are enemies not less furious than the heathen, I shall openly show the world that they do not scruple to devise the death of their enemies. The *Univers* may erroneously write, “The scandal in Rome is great,” because I am here and am betraying the secrets of Rome ; but one may say with full right, “The scandal in Christendom is great.”’

The bishops of the minority still declared their determination to resist every attempt to concentrate infallibility in the Pope ; but Darboy said to a diplomatist, What use is it to send in protests that never receive an answer?¹ The last protest, however, contained the grave matter in which a hun-

¹ *Tagebuch*, p. 219.

dred bishops pledged themselves to language casting doubt upon the oecumenicity of the Council. Of no use for its immediate purpose, that document will always be of real use in judging of the value of much that has been said by its signers since the Council. Prominent Infallibilists intimated that the dogma would not be so defined as to declare the opposite opinion a heresy. Yes, says Friedrich, they would leave it as Trent left the Immaculate Conception,—in such a position that some day, when the sun shines fair upon a Pope, it may be promulgated as a dogma! Then he adds, what many may have heard stated in Rome, It is strongly asserted that the very reason why the Council Hall has been placed where it stands, is that there at a certain hour the sunbeams fall upon the Papal throne (p. 219).

Vitelleschi says that the visitors to the Exhibition of Church Art did not generally exceed the number of the *gendarmes*, and expresses an opinion that the real Christian arts are better represented in such international exhibitions as might be seen elsewhere. Anything less like Christianity than many of the objects which in Rome are called objects of Christian art, is hard to conceive, or anything more fitted to turn men into triflers, if once they give themselves up to such baubles as the great concern of life, either social or religious. It will be curious to watch whether the progress of art hereafter is not much greater, and nobler, under the thought-culture of the Protestant countries than under the sense-culture of the Romish. The higher culture includes the lower, the lower may exclude the higher. The jeweller, milliner, laceman, and inventor of church *bric-à-brac*, may prove to be less helpful allies of the true artist than thinkers, writers, poets of nature, poets of the domestic affections, printers, and inventors of all useful things. Some one ought to examine carefully how many of the artists of notable merit in Rome for the last generation have been from Romish countries, and how many from Reformed ones; how many also of their patrons in high art have belonged

to the one creed and to the other. In this exhibition, Friedrich was struck with a statue of the Pope defining the Immaculate Conception, and with pictures of the same event, 'with the inevitable sunbeams.' He was also arrested by a group of the Risen Christ, with Pius standing before Him in a flowing pluvial. He says that when one looks at the humble figure of our Lord, and then at the self-conscious Pius, one is inclined to surmise that the latter is thinking, 'I am not only what Thou art, but much more. I command all ; Thou didst serve all' (p. 220). 'German gravity and reverence would not have allowed Friedrich to say such things when he first came to Rome ; but there the highest name is so often coupled with a very different one, and coupled in unseemly joke, that reverence is undermined. In this case, Friedrich had no idea of joking, but simply reproduced an impression which he must often have heard expressed by the initiated about him. Quirinus quotes, without translating it, a saying of an Italian noble, which might have suggested the very thought : 'Other Popes believed that they were Vicars of Christ ; but this Pope believes that our Lord is his Vicar in heaven' (p. 326). These are the things which the worshippers of Pius IX. call blasphemy, while most Italians smile if you doubt their legitimacy. Friedrich tells how the auditor of Cardinal Hohenlohe, an ecclesiastic, expressed the horror that had been caused in Rome by Friedrich's articles on Manning in the *Literaturblatt*. He added that Hohenlohe would have been a great Cardinal but for two blunders, that of visiting Cardinal Andrea when he returned to Rome, and that of bringing Professor Friedrich to the Council (p. 220).

The ministry of Prince Hohenlohe, in Bavaria, had fallen under the hostile influences of the Church party. On the other hand, the recent action of France and Austria had shown that possibly the Curia, if not prompt, might meet with more formidable checks than any that could arise from Bavaria. As to France, the Curia would seem, rightly or wrongly, to have felt that if Napoleon dared them to the worst, they could shake

him out of his place, if not as easily, yet as surely, as the bearers of the Pope's portative throne could upset a Pontiff. Daru's demands were officially made known by the reluctant, indeed the all but recalcitrant M. de Banneville, no earlier than the 1st of March. At this very time, Dupanloup was drawing up, and the French bishops were preparing to sign, the protest against the new Rules. The adhesion of the German and Hungarian bishops to this protest was to be foreseen. The Curia, therefore, took the decision to face both Bonapartes and bishops, and to throw down the gauntlet.

The meetings of General Congregations had been suspended to give the Fathers time for study. On the evening of March the 7th, a short notice was sent round to their houses, saying that an additional chapter, to be called the Eleventh, would be inserted in the Draft of Decrees on the Church. This new chapter was simply that declaration of Papal infallibility which had been asked for by the famous Address. So the die was cast. All uncertainty as to the designs of the Curia was at an end. Not only was the dogma to be defined, but all who should deny it were to be excluded from the unity of the Church. Quirinus says that the Pope gave his sanction to this critical act under great personal excitement. For four-and-twenty years had he sought the crown of infallibility, believing himself to be wrongfully deprived of it by the error and unbelief of mankind. In 1848, when Count Mamiani, after ceasing to be the Prime Minister of the new Pontiff, met his friends in Florence, he said, 'It is utterly impossible to act as the constitutional minister of a Pope who is stark mad on the subject of his own personal infallibility.'¹

The bishops found that they had only ten days allowed them to send in their written comments upon the fundamental change now impending in the constitution of the Church, in their creed,

¹ See a very life like sketch of Pio Nono in the *Manchester Examiner and Times* of December 17th, 1874, which, in Rome, is ascribed to the pen of Mr. Montgomery Stuart.

and in their standard of faith. Vitelleschi remarks that the brevity of the time given will remain as a testimony to the pressure exercised, and will lower the impression of the wisdom of men who hurried the Church through such a transformation.¹ The *Civiltà* states that the time was afterwards extended by a week.² If it was proposed to give to Orders of the Queen in Council all the scope and effect of Acts of Parliament, our Lords and Commons would expect at least one week beyond ten days' notice before meeting the Court party in the lists, and more particularly if the right of moving that the Bill should be read that day six months had been for ever snatched away from them. Yet, great as this change would be, great enough to rouse tranquil England to lion-like rage, it would be less than the change proposed in the Catholic kingdom. Every despotic royal order would contain in itself that benign alleviation of all human error which lies in being reformable.

A visit of the ex-Grand Duke of Tuscany, or, as the *Civiltà* takes care to call him, the Grand Duke, is formally recorded, as if to show the proper relations between princes and the Pontiff. On his arrival, the Grand Duke was waited upon by the majordomo and chamberlain of the Pope; and next day by Antonelli, as Secretary of State. The day following, the Grand Duke 'went to the apostolic palace to do homage to the Holy Father.' This is the true language of vassalage. To make it plainer, the Pope, on the same day, 'admitted the Archduke Charles of Tuscany to an audience.'³ It was, however, not encouraging for the projectors of 'a new world,' that the only princes who came with suitable reverence to the door which formed the entrance to it were princes who represented a world that had waxed old, had decayed, and indeed had vanished away.

¹ *Vitelleschi*, p. 177. ² Serie II., x., 112. ³ *Civiltà*, VII., x., 118.

BOOK IV.

*FROM THE INTRODUCTION OF THE QUESTION OF INFALLIBILITY
TO THE SUSPENSION OF THE COUNCIL.*

CHAPTER I.

Joy of Don Margotti—New Feelers for an Acclamation—Suggested Model of the Scene—Its Political Import—A Pause—Case of the Jesuit Kleutgen—Schwarzenberg out of Favour—Politics of Poland—Döllinger on the New Rules—Last Protest of Montalembert—His Death—Consequent Proceedings in Rome.

'THE Vicar of Jesus Christ for ever' was the title of the article in which Don Margotti announced the fact that the Pope had sent in the proposal of infallibility. Ollivier, said Don Margotti, once stated that he loved strong powers with confidence in themselves, and as the Pope always wished to be loved by ministers of Napoleon III, he had showed them that he was strong.¹ 'It is a great spectacle, but it will be a still greater one when infallibility is proclaimed, and the Syllabus is proclaimed, in spite of the opposition of governments, of revolutions, and of all hell.'

But the speedy closing of the question, now formally opened, was indispensable. The suggestion of an acclamation on the day of Mary in December had proved vain; but the day of Joseph was now approaching. The term allowed for sending in written observations on the Draft would expire on the 17th of March, and the *Unità*, in its number of the 11th, put up

¹ *Unità Cattolica*, March 10th.

the following prayer: ‘O Blessed St. Joseph, grant us the grace that on the 18th of March may be discussed, and on the 19th, the day of thy Festival, may be proclaimed, the most pleasant and most wise doctrine of the infallibility of the Vicar of Jesus Christ.’ The correspondent of the *Unità* from Rome said, ‘We hope for the definition on the 19th, St. Joseph’s Day;’ and its correspondent at Paris stated that no doubt existed that the dogma would be proclaimed on that day. Two days before the one so anticipated, the *Unità* published suggestive accounts of the scenes in 1854, when the Immaculate Conception was acclaimed. It quoted Canon Audisio, a well-known writer, and one sometimes called a Liberal Catholic. Just after the noon tide bell, when the two hundred bishops had knelt to repeat the Angelus, as soon as they resumed their seats, a cry speedily broke out from among them, *Pêtre, doce nos! confirma fratres tuos!* (Peter, teach us! strengthen thy brethren!) The teaching desired was a definition of the Immaculate Conception. The whole assembly wept. ‘It was a weeping so cordial and sublime that you cannot imagine it, and pen cannot describe it.’

After this hint, as to what the scene—always a chief point—on the 19th should be, the principles of polity involved in the scene are indicated; for in Rome all acting is for the purpose of ruling. Some prelates, said the *Araldo di Lucca*, as quoted by the *Unità*, had thought that the Bull announcing the dogma of the Immaculate Conception should make mention of the assembly of the bishops; but a prelate from France, rising *in the spirit of Athanasius*, said, ‘No; the episcopate should not decide, but only the chief Pontiff; he alone must speak.’ He went on to argue that, by showing obedience to the Pontiff, they would secure the obedience of the people, and strengthen the principle of authority. The *Unità* significantly adds, ‘It appears to us, and it will appear to all, that not only the dogma of the Immaculate was defined on that memorable sitting of the 24th of November, 1854, but also that of Papal infallibility.’

The *Unitá* may well note the superficial touch of John Lemoinne, when in the *Débats* he coolly says that the dogma of Infallibility no more affects France than did that of the Immaculate Conception. The prelate who spoke in the *spirit of Athanasius* was a better politician. He knew that an act in which an ancient oligarchy was formally ignored, and which would affect every diocese in France, was a real step towards the absorption of all other authority in that of the autocrat. And infallibility meant no less than the extension of the principle of that act to all organic legislation whatever.

While the party of movement was full of hope, the minority were in dismay. Their chosen ground of inopportuneness had been cut from under their feet. The Pope and five hundred bishops had decided that the question was opportune. They now felt that if the dogma should be suddenly defined, they must either submit or be outside of the Church. The new Rules permitted the discussion to be closed at the will of the majority. It was notorious that any discussion whatever, on a point so immediately affecting the authority of the Pope, not only in the Church, but also in the world, was hateful to every right-minded Curialist, and, in fact, that as taking place hard by the tomb of St. Peter, such a discussion was regarded as a thing all but intolerable. The suggestions in the *Unitá* from Rome, Paris, and Turin, had not been put out without high sanction. Was it possible that, on St. Joseph's Day, all would be ended by an irresistible acclamation?

Some think that so deep a feeling was now produced in the minority, and that so clear did they make it that they would not acquiesce in an acclamation, that they impressed the Vatican for a time. Friedrich repeats, on the authority of one who was intimate with the Pope, a saying of the latter, 'The Jesuits have set me on this road, and now I shall go on in it, and they must bear the responsibility.' The personal position of members of the minority became more and more trying, owing to the increasingly active part taken by the Pontiff in the

discussion. A second brief to the Jesuit Ramière¹ followed the one which ridiculed Maret, commanding another publication of the same author, in which, alluding to the possibility that some now opposing the infallibility of the Pope would secede from the Church, Ramière said, ‘These form the secret enemy who impedes our march, and, in driving him from our ranks, the sacred army will obtain the most precious guarantee of its future success.’² Friedrich adds, what agrees with much that is said, or hinted, by other Liberal Catholics, strange as it sounds in our ears, ‘Any one who knows the Jesuits can explain the closing words of the pamphlet, “Then, truly will the Council have realised the most ardent desire of the Saviour, and established the conditions on which this divine Master makes the submission of the entire world to the yoke of the faith depend.”’

‘That is,’ explains Friedrich, ‘the yoke of the Society of Jesus; for, even under the name Jesus, “we are only to understand the Society of Jesu.” At the Festival of St. Ignatius Loyola, priests must repeat the words, with great emphasis, “At the name of Jesu every knee shall bow.”’ The former Confessor of the Pope, now replaced by a Jesuit, always felt scandalised by this, on the eve of the Festival, and earnestly wished to have those words removed from the Mass for Loyola’s Day.’

Archbishop Cardoni, being asked what had become of the Draft Decrees on Faith, said that the committee first examined them, after which Deschamps, Pie, and Martin, as a sub-committee, partly prepared a revised form, and, finally, the recasting of them was completed by Kleutgen, the Jesuit. What, it was asked, the Kleutgen who was condemned by the Inquisition? Yes, replied the Archbishop, faintly. This Kleutgen had been a German political refugee, but joined the Jesuits, and became confessor to a nunnery. One of the nuns, a German princess, was dying. Her relations, through interest with the Pope, succeeded in procuring her release. It proved to be a case of poisoning. The Inquisitors took proceedings, and Kleutgen was somehow incriminated. The convent was closed, the nuns were dispersed into other establishments, and the confessor

¹ *Friedberg*, p. 491.

² *Tagebuch*, p. 221.

was sentenced to prison for six years. The imprisonment was changed into reclusion in one of the Jesuit houses, in a delightful neighbourhood near Rome. Kleutgen found means to regain favour, and was now remoulding the faith for the benefit of reconstituted society.¹

Cardoni told how he, an Archbishop, had been received the preceding day by the Pope before Schwarzenberg, a Cardinal and a prince, and it was added that Schwarzenberg had been obliged to wait a fortnight for his audience, whereas a Cardinal was entitled to have one after two days. Cardinal De Angelis alleged that the Pope had seen Schwarzenberg behind the Vatican smoking a cigar, with a 'small hat' on his head. To this the Germans replied that it was well known that Schwarzenberg did not smoke.² We cannot state what would be the penalty for a Cardinal convicted of wearing a small hat, but they are a class of 'creatures' whose eternal salvation may, by the will of their lord, be declared to depend on matters the connection of which with the Christian religion it takes a Pontiff to find out. Sixtus V. decreed the penalty of excommunication against any Cardinal who should open a letter bearing the plain address 'Cardinal,' without the title 'Most Illustrious and Most Reverend.' They were to burn such letters. (*Frond*, ii., p. xiii.) The *Univers* had a retort against the frequent slights thrown by German scholars on the learning of the Italian and Roman prelates. It said that, in respect of theological science, the Spanish prelates of the Council were folios, the Italians quartos, most of the French octavos, but the Germans, in general, were only pamphlets. The condition of things which permitted the possibility of such a joke is attributed by Friedrich to the selection of the Pope. He says that the Jesuits purposely chose for prelates men of the kind indicated.

The *Univers*, illustrating the doctrine of opportuneness, said that there were only three cases in the Scriptures in which

¹ *Tagebuch*, p. 230.

² *Ibid.*, p. 231.

the word ‘opportune’ occurred, and those occurred in the first three Gospels, in the passages where Judas was spoken of as seeking or finding an opportunity to betray our Lord. This was believed to be personally aimed at Dupanloup, for Nardi had told a tale which made a noise in Rome, that, after an exciting interview, in which Dupanloup had embraced the Pope, the latter said he only hoped it was not a Judas kiss.

Archbishop Ledochowski, whose name has frequently been heard of since the Council, had been made Primate of Poland by the Pope. This office, in olden time, carried with it the regency of the country, in the interregnum between the death of one king and the election of another. As primate, the Archbishop put on the colours of a Cardinal. Count L—— told Friedrich that Ledochowski had said that he was right glad that he had so early joined the Infallibilists, for Rome was certain to carry through what she had taken in hand, and, therefore, the bishops of the Opposition would gradually come over to the right side, and would cut a poor figure at the last. Count L—— expressed himself as indignant at this morality. But, said Friedrich, scarcely had the Count ended, when I read in the *Univers* that Ledochowski was mentioned for promotion as a Cardinal. We may here, as illustrating the bearing of titles and colours on very serious affairs, interject a statement of what happened later.¹ Ledochowski, after the Council, at once took up a new position. When the German bishops next met at Fulda, he would not join them. As Primate of Poland, he said, he belonged to the tomb of St. Adelbert rather than to that of St. Boniface. He would no longer admit Germans to his seminary for priests. In places where preaching had existed alternately in German and Polish, he suppressed the German. His organ, the *Tyotnick*, related how, during the Council, the Pope had given him the title of Primate of Poland, but denied that he *used* the political powers attached to the title. Nevertheless, the *Catholic Calendar* for

¹ Menzel, *Jesuitenuntrübe*, p. 297.

1872, published in Thorn, placed the name of Ledochowski in the list of reigning princes, as Primate of Poland and representative of the King of Poland. So that, if the powers attached to the title were not used, the reasons were not far to seek.¹

While early converts were joyful, Ketteler continued to be mysterious. In a meeting of German prelates he declared that, though all his life he had worked for infallibility, he could not do so now. This Draft Decree was a crime. But what was to be done? Send in another protest? All cried out at once, No! no! they have treated us like domestics, and not even given us an answer.²

On February the 27th Don Margotti had said that even a Protestant or a Mohammedan, a Schismatic or a Jew, would see from the new Rules that no assembly could be freer. A few days afterwards (March 2nd), he said, True, no decree had as yet been published; the Church was in travail, and the day of her deliverance would be the death of the Revolution. Döllinger, on the other hand, had published a letter on the new Rules. He took the ground indicated in the protest of the one hundred bishops. In matters of faith, as he contended, the Rules shifted the source of authority from tradition to majority. This he showed to be a direct departure from the doctrine of the Catholic Church. In reply, Don Margotti, on March 5th, gave a long history of Lola Montes, and said that the Court theologian would prove as ruinous to Ludwig II. as the Court dancer had proved to Ludwig I.

The days which some had fixed upon for the triumph of an acclamation were passed in excitement of a different kind. A

¹ The following passage in the speech made to the Pope by Ledochowski on his elevation to the purple, is taken from the *Emancipatore Cattolico*, April 22nd, 1876:—'And as the persecution was most bitter in that part of Poland which is now under Prussian occupation the honour of this sacred purple falls like a celestial dew upon my oppressed and agonised country, and seems silently to say to her, that if forgotten and abandoned of the world, she is still loved and blessed by God, of whom your Holiness is the Vicar.' The very next paragraph in the same paper is headed, *The Heresy of Love of Country*.

² *Tagebuch*, p. 236.

letter appeared in the *Gazette de France* and the *Times*, from Montalembert, addressed to some gentleman who had challenged his present opposition as inconsistent with his former championship of the Church. The dying man then delivered his last public utterance. He protested that, in his early days, the pretensions now put forth were unheard of. In language already cited he described the incredible change of the clergy after 1850, and their present shortsighted prostration before the idol they had set up. He showed that in his speech of 1847 there was not a word of the doctrine of Papal infallibility. He might have indicated also the still more celebrated speech on the restoration of Pius IX. He quoted that remarkable letter of Sibour, Archbishop of Paris, in which he depicted the difference between the old Ultramontanism and the new. Montalembert then declared that his whole regret was that illness prevented him from descending into the arena to join Dupanloup and Gratry, to contend on his own ground, that of history and of social consequences. 'Then should I merit—and it is my sole remaining ambition—a share in the *litanies of insult* daily launched against my illustrious friends by a portion, too numerous, of the clergy—that poor clergy which is preparing for itself so sad a destiny, and which formerly I loved, defended, and honoured, as no one in modern France had done.' The *Unità* cried, 'Better for Montalembert had he died a year ago; better indeed had he never been born.'¹ While these words were ringing in the ears of all, came a telegram announcing that Montalembert was no more. That evening the Pope had one of those audiences in which he delights; a kind of public meeting, with three hundred persons present. Of course every one expected that the little member which in the days of Pius IX. has done much to make the Pope an entertainment for Italians, would not be able to keep off the exciting topic. 'A Catholic has just died,' said his Holiness, 'who rendered services to the Church. He wrote a letter

¹ March 11th.

what year?

which I have read. I know not what he said at the moment of death; but I know one thing—that man had a great enemy, pride. He was a Liberal Catholic—that is to say, a half-Catholic. . . . Yes, Liberal Catholics are half-Catholics.¹

About the time when the Pope was thus speaking of him whose eloquence had been worth regiments to him, Father Combalot was crying from the pulpit of Notre Dame Della Valle:—

‘Satan has entered into Judas! There are men who were Christians, and who on the brink of the grave become enemies of the Pope, and speak of torrents of adulation, and accuse us of erecting him into an idol. To speak so is Satanic work. There are three academicians who do it’ [Montalembert, Gratry, and Dupanloup].²

Archbishop De Mérode, brother-in-law of Montalembert, and almoner to the Pope, arranged that a High Mass should be celebrated in the Araceli on the height of the Capitoline, that is, the church of the Roman municipality, in which Montalembert was entitled to the honour of such a solemnity because of the dignity of Roman citizen which had been conferred upon him for his distinguished services to the Church. On the 16th, a notice was circulated, announcing the intended Mass, in publishing which the *Univers* stated that it was known that there would be no oration,—a record which spoiled subsequent fables. Late that evening, in the great church of the French, a preacher dwelt upon the memory of Montalembert, inviting the audience to the solemn service at the Capitoline the next morning. At the same time the rooms of Archbishop Darboy were crowded. French prelates related what remarks they had written on the proposal for infallibility. Each one beheld in his own a great and heroic act. Landriot, Archbishop of Rheims,

¹ This is the version quoted from the *Moniteur Universel* in *Ce Qui se Passe au Concile*, p. 154. M. Veillot acknowledged that the ‘hard word’ was in the speech, and the above version has not been denied.

² *Ce Qui se Passe au Concile*, p. 155, quoting *Gazette de France*, March 20th. In the *Univers* of April 4th, quoted on the same page, Combalot acknowledged the words, and said that he was preaching at the time ‘by the grace and the mission of the infallible Pontiff.’

had employed a quotation from Bessarion against the curial system, and expected to be called Jansenist, Gallican, Febronian, and such like. Friedrich, we suspect, was making prelates understand that if once they allowed themselves to recommence deliberation under the new Rules, all hope of successful opposition would be idle, and hinting his belief that under such Rules the Council had no proper ecumenicity. Suddenly news came from Mérode. Something was wrong. It proved that the High Mass for Montalembert had been forbidden by the Pontiff. What! the departed spirit of the foremost Frenchman in the chivalry of the Church to be insulted on the Capitoline by the Pope in person! Among all those Frenchmen, many were old enough to remember the most brilliant of Montalembert's sallies, and all were old enough to have witnessed the public disgust when a Court chamberlain turned him out at the election of 1857, half of the clergy voting against him, and the other half staying at home. But this beat all. A Cardinal present could not restrain the confession, 'Now I am well ashamed of being a Roman Cardinal.'¹

The announcement was too late to reach all, and when the hour for the service came, some twenty bishops and many French notables assembled. Father Beckx, the General of the Jesuits, had come from the neighbouring *Gesù*, thinking, doubtless, of the splendid services to the Order which had been rendered by the confiding genius of the man for whose soul he was now to pray. Even Louis Veuillot came, trying to forget the irritations of recent years, perhaps hoping in part to make reparation for ingratitude and insolence, and unable now to see the opponent, seeing only as in old days the 'son of the Crusaders,' facing, provoking, and dominating a hostile Parliament, with his head back and his blue eye flashing, till at some turning-point in his theme the fountains of a great deep broke up, the deep of his mighty emotions, and then out gushed a flood which carried all before it. When they reached the

¹ *Tagebuch*, p. 259.

steps of the Araceli, an official, who was one of the subordinates of Mérode, cried out in a French phrase which he had learned on purpose, that they must go away, that the Mass was forbidden. It is evident that they were all overcome with mortification, not to use stronger language. Even M. Veuillot pushed by and said, ‘It can do no harm to repeat some pater-nosters for him.’¹

Quirinus says that probably it was De Banneville who represented to the Pope the serious effects that would be produced in France by this proceeding. So, on the evening of the 17th, instead of arranging for the acclamation of infallibility, the Pope was making the small amends of sending a private message to have a Mass celebrated, on the following morning, on behalf of a certain deceased Charles, in the Church of Santa Maria Traspontina. No public notice whatever was given of this service. The bishops were all shut up in a General Congregation. The Pope went privately, without any suite, sat hidden in a latticed ‘tribune,’ and then had it announced to the world that he had personally attended a Mass on behalf of Montalembert. When the exceedingly painful feeling he had caused began to appear, an attempt was made to turn the occasion to account by throwing the blame on Dupanloup. It was declared that it had been announced that he would deliver an oration, and indeed that the proposed function had been got up by him as a party demonstration. This gave Dupanloup the opportunity of writing² :—

‘This is an outrage at once upon the Holy Father, Monsignor De Mérode, the bishops, and myself. This entire tale, Sir, is false from the first word to the last. I did not appoint the service. I was not to officiate. I have had nothing whatever to do in distributing cards of invitation. Whatever may have been my profound and inviolable affection for M. De Montalembert, it belonged to the members of his family present

¹ This trait of kindly feeling is given by Friedrich.

² The fullest account of the whole transaction is that in *Ce Qui se Passa au Concile*. But Friedrich, Quirinus, Veuillot, and Fromman have all been consulted, and show that the main particulars admit of no doubt. Dupanloup’s letter is both in *Ce Qui se Passa au Concile*, and in German, in *Friedberg*, p. 110.

in Rome, Monsignor De Méröde and the Count De Méröde, and not to me, to arrange the details of this religious ceremony. It is within my knowledge that in doing so they conformed to all the laws and formalities usual in Rome in similar cases.'

The last statement was made to upset one of the excuses, that proper leave had not been asked for the service. So those false stories, at least, were stayed.

As the news spread in succession from place to place, the imaginations of Liberal Catholics all over Europe would restlessly wander up and down the Capitoline, seeing on that historical slope the signal given for their eternal disgrace in the Holy City. It was given too by an arrow shot from the Pontiff's own bow, and aimed at the shade of Montalembert. We do not profess to know what injury the imagination of such men might picture as having been done to the spirit that was gone, but those Christians who believe in a God who, not even in this world, much less in the great hereafter, trusts any child of man, though the least of all the little ones, to a Vicar,—those who believe in a sacrifice which no man can repeat, prohibit, or buy, when they heard what had occurred, saw the spirit pass into the true temple, *and outfly all the arrows of death*, and prayed that the old man, who knew not what he did, might not be left to the mercies of a fellow creature. Oh, how benign is that light of immortality which shows us the spirits of the departed resting in the hands of their Father, altogether above dependence on the malice or the compassion, on the liberality or the avarice, on the devotion or the unbelief of living men; and which, with the same blessed beam, shows us the living protected from all possible malice, raised into independence of all possible goodwill of the dead, by a near and solicitous paternal Watcher, who may, indeed, employ angel, human spirit, or sun or wind, as ministering servants for His children, but leaves it not to any of them ever to choose what shall be done to or for offspring of His, albeit He may give to them the office of doing it! In the eye of deep thought all the traffic of the

markets of Purgatory, a traffic as low and demoralising as any traffic can be, scarcely exposes the system which has sprung up around that invention so much as one broil like that which the traffickers raised around the soul of Montalembert,—no, not around his soul, that was beyond their reach, only around his memory.

CHAPTER II.

Threat of American Prelates—Acclamation again fails—New Protest—Decrees on Dogma—Ingenious connection of Creation with the Curia—Serious Allegations of Unfair and Irregular Proceedings of the Officials—Fears at the Opening of the New Session—The Three Devotions of Rome—More Hatred of Constitutions—Noisy Sitting ; Strossmayer put down—The Pope's Comments—He compares the Opposition to Pilate and to the Freemasons—He is reconciled to Mérode—The Idea of Charlemagne—Secret Change of a Formula before the Vote.

'THAT took effect,' wrote Quirinus, for once, in noting a step of members of the minority. The step so spoken of was a simple one. Four American prelates sent in a declaration that if any attempt was made to carry infallibility by acclamation, as had been suggested, they would leave the Council, go home, and publish their reasons for so doing.

Whether this proceeding alone, or this together with other indications, influenced the majority, certain it is that when the General Congregations were resumed, on March 18th, there was no acclamation. St. Joseph did not avail more for his day than the Immaculate had done for hers. All that we hear of any attempt to provoke an acclamation is the statement of Vitelleschi that one prelate tried to get infallibility carried 'by chance,' but received countenance only from very few. The minority gave in their protest against the new Rules to the Presiding Cardinals. We need not say that neither then nor at any later time did they receive an answer. The business now placed before the Fathers was the Draft of Decrees on Dogma as revised. The eighteen chapters had, under the hands of the committee, the

sub-committee, and Kleutgen, shrank to four. Even as they now stood, the chapters had to undergo considerable alteration before taking the shape in which they appear upon the *Acta*. As they stand there, they are not at first sight capable of interesting the theologian for their theology, or the politician for their bearing on politics. At the time, they led many to wonder why grave men should have spent years in formulating rudimentary principles, and that not very successfully. The alleged reason was that everything being wrong in the ideas of the age, the Church must commence by asserting the existence of a God, and the fact that He had created the world. An attempt was made to throw some dignity about this proceeding by quoting a prophecy of some saint, to the effect that an age would come when a General Council would have to do this. On the other hand, as Vitelleschi shows, Roman wit said that really, after sitting four months and a half, the Vatican Council would vote almost unanimously that God created the world. Friedrich, however, saw that the Curial system was insinuated in these Decrees, but it took a theologian to discern it, and one who was not a mere theologian. Yet when it was pointed out there could be no doubt of the fact. The simple headings, 'God, the Creator of the World,' 'Revelation,' 'Faith,' and 'Faith and Reason,' would to Protestant eyes seem very unlikely to cover any such purpose. Nevertheless, they are made to serve the purpose of laying a foundation for the dominion of the Church over all science and knowledge, for the dominion of the Pope, ay, even that of the Roman Congregations, over the Church, and for the lifting of men out of civil control into the higher sphere of Christian liberty, or, as the world would call it, for placing them under the dominion of ecclesiastical law. The process by which this is done is simple, and had been clearly indicated in the officious expositions of those judgments of the Syllabus which condemned 'naturalism.' First, God, as a personal Being, exists, has created the world, and rules it. Secondly, He gives a revelation by which man is raised above natural knowledge

and perfection to a higher knowledge and perfection. Thirdly, this revelation is a deposit committed to the Church, which holds in charge the Word of God, *written and traditional*; and all things are to be believed which she propounds as divinely revealed, whether they are propounded by solemn judgment, or by the ordinary teaching authority. Hence, naturally, all science must be held subject to this faith, and therefore subject to this Church; and *all things condemned in the Decrees of the Holy See* are to be held as anathema, even though not specified in the present Decrees.

The four chapters containing these principles would not fix the attention of any student if he took them up in a village of the Campagna or of Connaught as the work of the priest of the parish. He would be tempted to doubt whether the worthy man who faced Atheism and Pantheism with these weapons had ever really met with them face to face in either their ancient or modern forms. He might even be tempted to think that the intellectual life of the author had been passed within walls, and that so far as concerns the books and the minds which really sway contemporary thought in either of the directions indicated, he had scarcely ever felt their grip. But when we look at this document as the work of a great society, on the preparation of which had been employed the leisure of years by a few, and then the united counsels of a large yet elect number, it certainly does not exalt our idea of human gifts. But it is not well to let the critical contempt which German scholars especially have displayed for the Drafts while under discussion, and for the Decrees when ultimately framed, blind us to the practical success of this late but adroit creed. It is absolutely necessary to keep by us, and to use, the key given by the writers who had shown that Naturalism, including with other evils Liberalism, was embodied in Liberal associations, and developed in Liberal studies. For the purpose of laying a colourable theological basis under a municipal arrangement for governing mind and knowledge, belief and morals, consequently for governing laws

and institutions all over the world, by a college of Augurs called Christian priests, it was not a mere superfluity of the professors, as many seemed to think. Sambin, Guérin, and other writers, not to mention prelates in abundance, struck a note, which is now taken up in colleges, seminaries, and schools. These compact chapters, being once exalted to the level of the Word of God, formed a short and easy method for connecting the Creator and the creation of the world with the last edict of the Vatican.

One of the startling statements in the secret memorandum, *La Liberté du Concile*, touches this Decree. A conclusion to it was proposed which to many appeared to include infallibility. This was strongly opposed. The committee withdrew it, saying that it would be reserved to the end of the final chapter on Faith. This step was applauded. The next day, or the next but one, however, the reporter announced that the vote upon it would be taken then and there. Eighty-three, in voting, demanded modifications ; which, according to the Rules, compelled a consideration by the committee of the amendments they proposed. The committee finally resolved, with one dissentient, to substitute a new wording which would satisfy all. But when the moment came to vote, before the reporter mounted the pulpit, a communication was put into his hands. This attracted the attention of the Fathers. He mounted the pulpit, but did not report what the committee had adopted ! He did report what it had set aside ! The vote was instantly called for—no one could speak, the Rules did not allow it. The majority did its duty ; and the wording, surreptitiously reported, was made ‘of Faith.’¹

Strong and circumstantial confirmation of this incredible statement is given in Kenrick’s unspoken speech.² Incidentally he says, ‘The reporter, while we wondered what was the matter, suddenly recommended this conclusion, which had been first submitted and then withdrawn.’ This he says only on his way to tell Archbishop Manning that if the sense put by him upon this famous conclusion was the true one, the reporter

¹ *Doc.*, i., 176.

² *Ibid.*, i., 225.

was either himself deceived or had, knowingly, deceived the bishops. Deceiver or deceived, his declaration had won many votes. To get the clause passed, the reporter said it taught no doctrine, and was only a conclusion to round off the chapters. But when once passed, Manning cited it as concluding the question of infallibility, and making it improper for the bishops to discuss that question any longer.¹ Kenrick confesses that at the time he feared a trap. The writer of *La Liberté du Concile* declares that if the liberty of the Council was doubtful, this incident proved the liberty of the committees to be more doubtful still.

The sitting was opened with evident anxiety on both sides. The minority feared the threatened attempt at acclamation ; the majority feared that the minority would formally refuse to enter on deliberation under the new Rules. When, however, instead of action, the paper protest was given in, and the reporter for the committee, Simor, Primate of Hungary, had mounted the pulpit, and things had resumed their course, the majority were evidently relieved. They knew that the minority had now committed themselves to the new Rules ; and that, however they might recalcitrate hereafter, they would no more be able to shake off the meshes of the net than they had been in the past to shake off those of the old Rules. Five speakers had inscribed their names. They were supporters of the committee. It proved that the acoustics of the Hall had really been improved by a boarded partition which had been substituted for the curtain. When three had spoken the bell of the President rang, and the speaker then in possession was stopped. The

¹ Kenrick's words are : *Dixit verbis clarioribus, per illud nullam omnino doctrinam edoceri ; sed eam quatuor capitibus ex quibus istud decretum compositum est imponi tanquam eis coronidem convenientem ; eamque disciplinarem magis quam doctrinalem characterem habere.* Aut deceptus est ipse, si vera dixit Westmonasteriensis ; aut nos sciens in errorem induxit, quod de viro tam ingenuo minime supponere licet. Utcumque fuerit ejus declarationi fidentes, plures suffragia sua isti decreto haud deneganda censuerunt ob istam clausulam ; aliis, inter quos egomet, dolos parari metuentibus et aliorum voluntati hac in re segre cedentibus.

Pope was descending to view the sacred relics, and the Fathers had to break up to form a procession in his train. Not one of them had been called to swell that train in the morning when he went, not to see and to be seen, but to the mass for 'a certain Charles.' At the close of this anxious sitting Bishop Pie congratulated Cardinal Bilio, 'It has gone off well.' So it had ; the minority were now fairly enclosed in the net.

M. Veuillot cries, 'There are three great devotions in Rome : the Holy Sacrament, the Holy Virgin, and the Pope. Rome is the city of the Real Presence, and the city of the Mother of God, and the city of the Vicar of Jesus Christ.'¹ That saying sheds a clear light on the effect of materialising and localising the idea of the *divine presence* by such notions as that of transubstantiation. Again, Veuillot asserts that the Pope is the only man in the world who looks as if he knew where he was going, even in a physical sense. But as about this time the writings of the prelates of the Opposition were giving considerable annoyance in Rome, he describes the reply of Dupanloup to Deschamps as having no serenity, no severity, no solidity ; nothing like a monument, not even like an edifice. As a specimen of the variegated latinity which regaled Rome during the Council, he tells of one describing certain priests as saying mass *in pantilonibus*. The show of constitutional reforms just then being made in Paris by Napoleon III., contrasting as it did with what was being done in Rome, naturally disgusted M. Veuillot. He said that the title of Emperor now seemed grotesque. It was sad to witness the crown turned into a curiosity of the museum, or an accessory of the theatre. This was his idea of a constitutional crown. He consoled himself, however, by the thought that the tiara remained to us. Happily it was more solid than the crown. Pius IX., he said, would bequeath it to his successor more brilliant and more indestructible. Scandal of the world ! kingdoms everywhere and no kings ! Here is a king,

¹ Vol. i, 389.

but no kingdom! Let Liberals come to the Vatican and attempt to take liberties with the constitution. Let even universal suffrage attempt it; let it try to make any change here in which the guardian of the constitution does not concur.¹

The noisy sitting of March 22nd has had its echoes all over the world. The contradictions given by inspired writers to the uninspired ones appear to be even less definite than usual. We may content ourselves with giving that of Cardinal Manning as the sum of them all:—

‘Having from my earliest remembrance been a witness of public assemblies of all kinds, and especially of those among ourselves, which for gravity and dignity are supposed to exceed all others, I am able and bound to say that I have never seen such calmness, self-respect, mutual forbearance, courtesy, and self-control, as in the eighty-nine sessions of the Vatican Council. In a period of nine months the Cardinal President was compelled to recall the speakers to order perhaps twelve or fourteen times. In any other assembly they would have been inexorably recalled to the question sevenfold oftener and sooner. Nothing could exceed the consideration and respect with which this duty was discharged. Occasionally murmurs of dissent were audible; now and then a comment may have been made aloud. In a very few instances, and those happily of an exceptional kind, expressions of strong disapproval and of exhausted patience at length escaped. But the descriptions of violence, outcries, menace, denunciation, and even of personal collisions, with which certain newspapers deceived the world, I can affirm to be calumnious falsehoods, fabricated to bring the Council into odium and contempt.’²

La Liberté du Concile confirms that portion of this statement which says that the speakers were often allowed to deliver irrelevant matter, when, in other assemblies, they would have been called back to the question. It says that no bishop of the majority could be named who was ever interrupted, although some of them strayed from the question so far that, in the first stages of the proceedings, they rushed into the question of infallibility.³

The first speaker in the celebrated sitting of March 22nd, was Schwarzenberg. He was not favourable to the Curia, their proceedings, or their plans. He had not felt an impres-

¹ Vol. i., p. 398 ff.

² *Pot. Priv.*, iii., 27, 28.

³ *Doc.*, i., p. 172.

sion in the Congregations as if a Council was being held. At last the terrible bell was heard. It was faint, but it was certainly sounding. What! a Cardinal rung down?—and Schwarzenberg, with his princely rank, his historical name, his age, and his majestic presence! Even among the Cardinals, it is said, there was a slight murmur—a greater one among the bishops. But Schwarzenberg himself heard bravos for the President.¹ But the stately old man held his own.² After two other prelates had succeeded to the precarious honour in which the Prince Cardinal had been challenged, Strossmayer mounted the pulpit.

He attacked the statement contained in the Draft Decrees, that Protestantism was the source of the several forms of unbelief specified in that Draft. In making such an assertion, the Curia is no happier in its history than when, meaning to disgrace Protestantism, it asserts that all modern liberties are its offspring, forgetful of the facts that bare-footed freemen trod the streets of Rome ere a baptized Pontiff ever pranced up the Quirinal, and that bare-footed freemen discussed law and philosophy on the banks of the Tiber when, to their eyes, the Pontiff, if they knew his title or his rites, was the rude but ceremonious and dressy priest of an obscure, rising Western city. Strossmayer showed that the worst revolutions and the worst outbursts of infidelity had not been in Protestant countries, and that Catholics had not produced better refutations of atheism, pantheism, and materialism than had Protestants, while all were indebted to such men as Leibnitz and Guizot. The Senior President, Cardinal De Angelis, cried, ‘This is not a place to praise the Protestants;’ and having got so far in Latin, he declined into some other tongue.³ No, says Quirinus, it was not the place, being within some few hundred paces of the Inquisition. The excitement had now become great. Strossmayer proceeded, amid partial clapping

¹ *Tagebuch*, 277.

² *Tagebuch*, 278.

³ *Lib. du Con.*, Doc. i., p. 172.

of hands and general murmurs of disapproval, to demand how they meant to apply the principles embodied in the new Rules, of making a dogma by a majority. When he cried 'That alone can be imposed on the faithful which has in its favour a moral unanimity of bishops,' up rose Cardinal Capalti, rang the bell, and, in a voice anything but courteous, as Vitelleschi says, ordered the speaker to stop. Strossmayer replied that he was tired of being called to order, and of being thwarted at every point; that such proceedings were incompatible with freedom of debate, and that he protested.¹ Then burst out an uproar that alarmed all who were outside in the church. Strossmayer stood, lifted up his hands, and thrice cried solemnly, 'I protest! I protest! I protest!' Some one shouted, 'You protest against us, and we protest against you.' As the Archbishop of Rheims afterwards related, one of the majority stood up and shouted to Strossmayer, 'We all condemn thee!' Bishop Place, of Marseilles, cried, 'I do not condemn thee.' Some one called Strossmayer a cursed heretic. Some shook their fists, some crowded round the pulpit, some cried 'Pius IX. for ever!' some cried, 'The Cardinal Legates for ever!' and others, as Vitelleschi adds, made noises equally serious and serene. *La Liberté du Concile* speaks of the unheard of violence, of the cries which rang through the basilica outside, and of the menaces of a large number who rushed to the tribunal and surrounded it.² Friedrich speaks of clenched fists, and of fears least the prelates should tear one another's hair.

The people in the church interpreted the commotion each man according to his own mind. Some—and that wild interpretation is laid to the door of the English—thought the Garibaldians had attacked the Fathers; some, that the long looked for dogma had at last sprung, full armed, out of the head of the assembly, and that all the uproar was caused by alarm at the portent. These raised cries of 'Long live the Infal-

¹ *Vitelleschi*, 128.

² *Doc.*, i., p. 172.

fessions of a Masonic agent, who showed how Masonry had no better ally in its revolutionary plans than the Liberal Catholics ; and he concluded by the supreme disclosure, ‘ We have in the Council the organs of the Liberal party, whose word of command is to gain time by opposing everything, and to wear out the patience of the majority.’ The allusion of the Pope was understood. Bitter, indeed, was it for the bishops of the minority to find themselves thus stigmatised before all men by the sovereign. But the effect was practical. The day following, ten Orientals announced their adhesion to the denunciation of Gratry by the Archbishop of Strasburg. Presently, forty-three missionary bishops published their concurrence in the profound discovery of Bonjean, of Ceylon, that the dogma of infallibility would conduce to the conversion of Buddhists, Brahmins, Protestants, and other difficult religionists of the East.¹

Among Veuillot’s anecdotes of the Pope, one evidently represents the reconciliation with Mérode after the Montalembert breach. Mérode had the character of being outspoken in the presence of his master, and of having, more than once, provoked him to violent outbursts. As to the affair of Montalembert, it is said that the High Almoner made no secret of his indignation, and that the Pope meant to have him out of the palace. It would appear, however, that eventually Mérode had consented to send in a letter, which a lady of the family presented, and the Pope graciously received. He took Mérode’s head between his hands, says Veuillot, and when he afterwards met him in the corridor on crutches—for the High Almoner was suffering from a broken leg—the Pope stopped, and said, ‘ Poor man! poor man! (Mérode was immensely rich) we must give him something,’ and handed him a small piece of money.

As the Pope went to St. Cross of Jerusalem for the *Agnus Dei*, M. Veuillot heard cries of ‘ The Infallible Pope for ever ! ’ and said that this was a reply to the objections raised about the heresy of Pope Honorius. Hefele had unpleasantly brought

¹ *Ce Qui se Passe au Concile*, 163.

this heresy into notice in a Latin pamphlet, which he had been obliged to print at Naples. Of inopportune things, few had been more inopportune of late than the appearance in Paris of a new edition of the *Liber Diurnus*, by Rozière. This ancient monument, with its simple formulæ and infallible evidence, enabled every one to lay his finger on the fact that for centuries Popes had on oath abjured the heresy of Pope Honorius. But M. Veuillot heard an answer to all this in the cries of 'The Infallible Pope for ever !'

But of all that the Pope passed on his route to Holy Cross, that which most excited the imagination of M. Veuillot was the Holy Stair and the *triclinium*, where Charlemagne received the sword kneeling. Charlemagne, he says, ruled only long enough to indicate the place and form which he wished to give to his throne ; but now, after a thousand years, his conception is one of the victorious apparitions.

'When the world merits to re-enter on the path of unity, God will raise up a man, or a people, which will be Charlemagne. This Charlemagne, man or nation, will be seen here, at the Lateran, kneeling before the Pope, returned from dungeons or from exile ; and the Pope will take the sceptre of the world off the altar, and put it into his hands.'¹

M. Veuillot knows better than he here seems to know. Charlemagne's conception was that of Constantine over again—a State Church ; and over a State Church Charlemagne reigned. The conception of Hildebrand, now to be acted out, was that of a Church State, for which any Charlemagne might conquer, but over which no second head should reign. Unity, as M. Veuillot well knew, was now to comprehend not only one *fold*, but also one *shepherd*. No more dualism ! no more two-headed monsters ! We had come to the dispensation of the spiritual David, Shepherd and King in one. It is, however, clear that the vision revealed to M. Veuillot, as in 1867, still disclosed a struggle to come before the victory ; for his Pope, on taking his place as disposing of the sceptre of the world, comes back from

¹ Vol. i., p. 443.

dungeons or from exile. Moreover, Veuillot still smothers the poor kings in ambiguity. The new and final Charlemagne is to be a man *or a nation*.

The sittings which followed the stormy one were remarkably still; and it is said that Haynald and Whelan from Wheeling were allowed to say very strong things without interruption. It might be supposed that a short chapter on God the Creator of the World, could hardly give rise to a discussion on the Curial system; but when Rome set out to speak about the Creator, she first of all made mention of herself. The opening words of the chapter were, 'The Holy Roman Catholic Apostolic Church.' To this form exception was taken. One proposed that the word 'Roman' should be omitted, which was, of course, offensive to the Curia, the municipal spirit always forcing into view the shibboleth, quite unconscious that it marred the show of universality. Indeed, it is asserted by many that the extreme Curialists wanted the words 'Roman Church' alone, without Catholic. Others proposed that the word 'Catholic' should stand before 'Roman,' or at least that a comma should be inserted between the two. It is a singular fact that a vote of the Council was actually taken on this question of the comma. On this great question of the comma the committee for once did not tell the majority how to vote. *La Liberté du Concile* thinks that the majority voted for the comma. The numbers, however, were not reported in that sitting; and when the next one was opened, and all waited to hear on which side was the majority, lo! the reporter gets up, and, contrary to all rule, usage, and decency, quietly sets aside the vote as if it had never taken place; does not, indeed, mention it! He simply says that the committee has rejected the comma! Now the majority, knowing how it ought to vote, did its duty faithfully. So even about a tithe, in the literal sense, the writer of *La Liberté du Concile* was highly incensed, contending that the rights of deliberation were ridden over roughshod. Finally, the phrase came out as 'The Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman

Church.' Friedrich thinks that this phraseology compromises the claim to represent the Universal Church, and must be taken as only professing to represent the Roman Patriarchate. The order first observed presented a shrinking series of circles,— 'Apostolic,' a term as large as the institute of Christ; 'Catholic,' a limiting term set up to distinguish Christian from Christian, but on the largest basis, that of 'general' as opposed to 'peculiar'; and then 'Roman,' a fearful contraction to a municipal meaning, and one taken from a centre at first purely political. The order observed in the second case is not either logical or historical. Not historical, for 'Catholic,' the term set first, is a more recent one than 'Apostolic,' as 'Roman' is more recent than 'Catholic.' Not logical, for we begin with the distinguishing term 'Catholic,' then go on to the all-comprehending one 'Apostolic,' and suddenly come back to the narrow local one 'Roman.'

Meantime the minority held anxious deliberations. They doubted whether they should not require a positive promise that no Decree touching faith should be carried by a majority, and whether if this was denied they should not refuse to take part in voting. They finally resolved that they would reserve their opposition, as completely as possible, for the all-important question of infallibility. They hoped by this means to secure the double end of showing a conciliatory disposition in everything in which they could give way with a good conscience, and of preventing a precedent from being established for carrying articles of faith by majorities. The last piece of strategy seemed specious. It, however, obviously laboured under the infirmity that they were all the time giving strength to the Rules which established the principle of majorities.

The preamble to the revised Draft of Decrees on Dogma contained not only the passage about Protestantism which Strossmayer had criticised, but also a clause suggested by the Bishop of Moulins, which virtually contained the doctrine of infallibility. This was strongly resisted by the minority, but

all attempts to get it withdrawn had proved vain. In the sitting of the 26th, the order and method of voting, which was now for the first time to be put in practice, was fully read out. But before the vote was taken, a paper was sent in to the Presiding Cardinals, said to proceed from Bishop Clifford of Clifton. The Presidents left the Hall, and on their return, to the surprise of all, the preamble, instead of being put to the vote, was withdrawn. When it reappeared, the objectionable passage about infallibility was removed, and the phrase as to Protestantism was moderated; and so the impending collision was averted. But the way of doing this showed that majority and minority were equally far from possessing the guarantees of legislative freedom. What would a powerful majority in our Parliament say if, after the clauses in a Bill had been settled in Committee, the Ministers should retire and decide on altering them, and without a word present them in a new form to the House for the final vote when no one could speak?

CHAPTER III.

Important Secret Petition of Rauscher and others—Clear Statement of Political Bearings of the Question—A Formal Demand that the Question whether Power over Kings and Nations was given to Peter shall be argued—Complaints of Manning—Dr. Newman's Letter—The *Civilità* exorcises Newman—Veuillot's Gibes at him—Conflicts with the Orientals—Armenians in Rome attacked by the Police—Priests arrested—Broil in the Streets—Convent placed under Interdict—Third Session—Forms—Decrees unanimously adopted—Their Extensive Practical Effects.

THE dangers opening in the future defined themselves more and more clearly to the eyes of the bishops as the import of the constitutional changes now in progress was more fully apprehended. Reflection, conversation, and reading had done much since they came to Rome to clear their views. Even if they read as little of Church history, or of the current Curial litera-

* which year?

ture, as is intimated in the oft-repeated laments of Friedrich, and in the less frequent but equally strong hints of Quirinus and others, they must surely have read something of the *Unitá*, if not of the *Civiltá*, or at least of the sprightly *Univers*. Any one of the three, in spite of that pious style of mystery which Vitelleschi speaks of, would soon have made a very dull bishop indeed conscious that the world was going to be transformed.

The sagacious Rauscher put the forecast of the time into the form of a petition, dated April 10th, which states the case of the future position of Roman Catholic citizens more strongly than some statements of it in our country, which have been treated as the invention either of Mr. Gladstone, or at best of Lord Acton, or of some other Liberal Catholic.¹ The petition is headed as being from several prelates of France, Austria, Hungary, Italy, England, Ireland, and America. The editor of the *Documenta* says that Germany should have been added. Among the prelates from that country who signed it he specifies the Archbishops of Munich and Bamberg, the Bishops of Augsburg, Tréves, Ermland, Breslau, Rottenburg, Maintz, Osnabrück, and the Prussian Military Bishop. According to this statement, the name of Ketteler was to this document. When the German bishops met again at Fulda, after the Council, they put forth the very interpretation of the Bull *Unam Sanctam* which is here solemnly treated as both false and absurd. Of course they were confronted with their own words. Friedrich says, in a note (p. 349), that Ketteler, in the *Reichstag*, and in the well-known *Germania* No. 146, for 1872, asserted that no German bishop had signed the petition, and that, therefore, the word 'Germany' was not found in the superscription:—

'But all this is vain lying and cheating, such as we are well accustomed to in the Ultramontane press and its episcopal inspirers. In No. 242 of the *Germania* Ketteler himself owns that two German bishops, not Prussian, signed it. In reference to this, a theologian, deeply initiated in the secrets of the minority, writes to me under date June 20th, 1871, that there are many Germans among the signatories.'

¹ *Documenta*, ii., 388.

Rauscher, and those who signed with him, alleged that the point about to be decided bore directly on the instruction to be given to the people, and on the relations of civil society to Catholic teaching. Disclaiming any thought of accusing the Popes of the middle ages of ambition, or of having disturbed civil society, and asserting their belief that what the Pontiffs then did was done by virtue of an existing state of international law, they go on to say that those Popes held that our Lord had committed two swords to the successors of Peter; one, spiritual, which they themselves wielded; the other, material, which princes and soldiers ought to wield at their command. Then dealing with the attempt to represent this Bull as requiring only that all shall acknowledge the Pope as the head of the Church, they declare that gloss to be irreconcilable with love of the truth on the part of any one who is acquainted with the circumstances as between Boniface VIII. and Philip le Bel; and that, moreover, it is a mode of treating the subject which puts weapons into the hands of the enemies of the Church to calumniate her. They add, 'Popes, down to the seventeenth century, taught that power over temporal things was committed to them by God, and they condemn the opposite opinion.' Mark, they do not say temporal authority, but power over temporal things.' With them temporal authority is authority of temporal origin.

Now follows a historical statement of great importance. 'We, with nearly all the bishops of the Catholic world, propound another doctrine to the Christian people as to the relation of the ecclesiastical power to the civil.' They then make the stock comparison of the heavens and the earth, as indicating the relative dignity of the spiritual and temporal power, and say that each is supreme in its own sphere. It is not for poor earthworms like us to ask in what sense earth as compared with the heavens is supreme, or in what sphere. Left for one moment without the hold of the invisible, all-surrounding hand by which the heavens stay it in its place, blind earth were at

once away into wild wreck. If left for a week without the kindly heat which the heavens with glowing bosom ever pour upon it and into it, ere the end of that week it would be only the sepulchre of all its inhabitants, whether man or animal. The ambiguous phrase ‘supreme in its own sphere,’ means, in Ultramontane language, as we have seen, only that the temporal prince is not subject to any other temporal power. But these bishops evidently meant at the time to be clear of ambiguities. They added an explanation of immense significance—‘Neither power in its office is dependent upon the other.’ This is a formal and total denial of what the *Civilità* had long been preaching, of what Phillips and Tarquini and all the accredited modern writers taught. The utmost they ever admit is, that in its *nature*, and in its *origin*, temporal power is, or may be, independent of the spiritual. But in office all impersonated authorities must be dependent on the impersonated authority of the Vicar of God. The next stroke of the petitioners was still bolder. Admitting that princes, as members of the Church, are subordinate to her discipline, they affirm that she does not in any way hold a power of deposing them, or of releasing their subjects from their allegiance. Still more incisive was the stroke that followed, for it was aimed at the whole principle of Papal authority over the State. They declared that the power of judging things, which the Popes of the middle ages had exercised, came to them by a certain state of public law; and that, as the public institutions and even the private circumstances which then existed had changed, the power itself has with the foundation of it passed away. This was the language which might be used before the Bull *Unam Sanctam* had received the stamp of infallibility. It was language in which the claims founded on the text ‘Teach all nations,’ or ‘I have set thee this day over the nations, and over the kingdoms,’ are met with a downright denial. The fact that the Popes had at one time acted as supreme judges was accounted for by a state of political relations, not by a divine right, just,

we may say, as the fact would have been accounted for that the kings of Persia were appealed to as arbiters by Greeks. Still further, the change which had taken place was not only admitted, but it was held to have annulled the former relation between the power of the Papacy and civil society. A careful consideration of the positions thus stated, and a comparison of them with matter in the Curial writings of the present pontificate with which we are already familiar, afford some measure of the distance separating the Ultramontanes north of the Alps, of the old type, like Rauscher among the clergy and Montalembert among the laity, from the new school formed by the development of the Jesuits into what had now become the Catholic party. We do not say that the old Ultramontanes did not give the Pope authority irreconcilable with Holy Scripture, and power dangerous to civil society. All we can say is that the authority and power which they did give to him was bounded by a frontier tolerably defined, and therefore capable of being defended.

The remark of the Pope, carried away from the Vatican by numbers of bishops and not a few laymen, and repeated in every form of gossip printed or spoken, to the effect that the bishops of the Opposition were only time-servers and Court ecclesiastics, is in Rauscher's petition repelled with dignity and force. Their opinions, as just stated, they declare are not new but ancient. They were those of all the Fathers, and of all the Pontiffs down to Gregory VII. They believed them to be the true doctrines of the Catholic Church; for God forbid that, under stress of the times, they should adulterate revealed truth. But they must point out the dangers which would arise to the Church from a Decree irreconcilable with the doctrines that they have hitherto taught. No one, they affirm, can help seeing that it is impossible to reform (they do not say reconstruct) society according to the rule laid down in the Bull *Unam Sanctam*. But any right which God has indeed given, and any obligation corresponding to such right, is incapable of being destroyed by the vicissitudes of human institutions and opinions.

If then the Roman Pontiff had received the power of the two swords, as it is asserted in the Bull *Ex Apostolatus Officio*, he would, by divine right, hold plenary power over nations and kings ; and it would not be allowable for the Church to conceal this from the faithful. But if this was the real form of Christianity as an institution, little would it avail for Catholics to assert that, as to the power of the Holy See over temporal things, that power would be restrained within the bounds of theory, and that it was of no importance in relation to actual affairs and events, seeing that Pius IX. was far from thinking of deposing civil rulers.

This last statement was directly aimed at Antonelli's habitual mode of putting the case in conversation with diplomatists, and also as we have seen in his despatches. But our prelates contend that, in reply to such assertions,

'opponents would scornfully say, We do not fear the sentences of the Pontiffs ; but after many and various dissimulations, it has become evident at last that'—(the italics are our own)—'every Catholic, whose actions are ruled by the faith he professes, is a born enemy of the State, since he finds himself bound in conscience to contribute, as far as in him lies, to the subjection of all nations and kings to the Roman Pontiff.'

On these solemn grounds they formally demand that the question whether our Lord did or did not commit power over kings and nations to Peter and to his successors shall be directly proposed to the Council and examined in every aspect. In order that the Fathers may not be called without adequate preparation to decide a question the consequences of which must profoundly affect the relations of the Church and civil society, they demand further that this point shall be brought on for discussion before that of infallibility. Their petition was not addressed to the Pontiff in person, but to the Presiding Cardinals.

No efforts made since, or which may be made hereafter, can erase this record of the views of the bishops at the time in question. Their conduct since the Council proves that for themselves, as individuals, conviction is lost in submission.

For them dogma has conquered history. With the German bishops submission passed beyond silence, and proceeded as far as deliberately certifying to the public as ancient views and sincere ones the very views which they had secretly shown to be innovations and pretences, alien to ancient teaching and to their own belief. God's two priceless jewels, conscience and conviction, are here sent to the bottom of the stagnant pool of submission to a human king. It is by contemplating such a course of conduct in men with a position to hold in the eye of the sun, that we learn the force of such words as those of Vitelleschi, when he says that the frequent collision in Catholic countries between a man's civil conscience and his ecclesiastical one is the reason why so often there is no conscience at all. Again, referring to certain acts of the Roman clergy during the Council, he says (p. 164) :—

'Some of the clergy evidently did violence to their convictions, for as infallibility was not yet declared, they were by no means bound to accept it from the duty of submission. But according to certain Ultramontane notions of discipline, authority has a conscience for all. This substitution of the *dicta* of an external authority for those of the individual conscience in all cases is one of the chief causes of the evils that disturb Catholicism.'

And men such as these German bishops are the moral guides of millions! and out of millions so guided States have to be built up, and men have to be fitted for the judgment of Him who requireth truth in the inward parts! And Vitelleschi evidently thinks that, in a moral point of view, the German bishops were the best!

Gossip in Rome spoke of Dr. Manning as burning with impatience at the delays which had been interposed in the way of the forthcoming dogma. Baron Arnim told Friedrich how it was said that the Archbishop prophesied that the governments would be annihilated for their resistance to it.¹ Quirinus speaks of the Archbishop as expecting a wonderful dispensation of the Holy Ghost to follow the promulgation of the dogma, and to

¹ *Tagebuch*, p. 283.

smooth the way of the Church in her regeneration of the nations. Whatever may have been the amount of correctness in these details, the fact remains that at that moment a mind which had attracted notice to itself as urging Englishmen to Rome for unity, was bitterly complained of by Liberal Catholics as being the very genius of contraction and division, urging their Church either to beat them down or to cast them out,—to make herself too narrow for them, and to tell them that they should be endured only on new conditions.

At the same time a cry came from our own shores. It was the voice of one who had made himself conspicuous by alluring Englishmen towards Rome for certainty, and on whose spirit the shadow of a new and dark uncertainty was now settling down—uncertainty as to the future source of doctrinal truth ; uncertainty as to the doctrinal authority of existing documents ; uncertainty, in fine, as to what had been, and as to what was to be, the oracle ; uncertainty as to the future work of God. At the same moment when Dr. Manning was accused by Roman Catholics of violating the old terms of unity, Dr. Newman was turned into a warning to Protestants as a victim of uncertainty. When describing how he and his party fared when first, after shifting from the rock of Holy Scripture, they settled on another foundation, which they called Anglicanism or the *Via Media*, Dr. Newman had said :—

'There they found a haven of rest ; thence they looked out on the troubled surge of human opinion and upon the crazy vessels which were labouring without chart or compass upon it. Judge, then, of their dismay when, according to the Arabian tale, on their striking their anchor into the supposed soil, lighting their fires on it, and fixing in it the poles of their tents, suddenly the island began to move, to heave, to splash, to frisk to and fro, to dive, and at the last to swim away, spouting out inhospitable jets of water upon the credulous mariners who had made it their home.'¹

We can hardly doubt that some English parson who in his youth had for a moment felt attracted by the notion of unity

¹ *The Tractarian Movement.*

and certainty, by the charm of vestments, processions, and banners, thanked God on the morning after he had read the following letter, when he looked at the family Bible, that he had not left the solid ground and set up a tent on what Dr. Newman and his Anglicans told people was solid ground, but which proved to be the sporting and frisking monster that he himself described. Ay, and perhaps some Cornish miner, as he went down into his darkness, happy in his Saviour,—a Saviour who seemed to come nearer to him as day and man, as home and the fair sky, went farther away,—so happy that he hummed—

‘In darkest shades, if Thou appear,
My dawning is begun :
Thou art my soul’s bright morning star,
And Thou my rising sun,’—

perhaps this miner put up a prayer for the poor gentleman in Birmingham who was in such uncertainty about what might be his creed by next Christmas, and yet knew no better than to beg of Augustine and Ambrose to prevail upon the Almighty not to let His Church tell out all the truth about the Vicar whom the gentleman fancied that He had set over her, but to cause her to practise reserve, or to speak in non-natural senses.

To avoid contamination by impure authorities we shall follow only the *Civiltà* in its narrative of the Newman incident.¹ The *Standard* stated that Dr. Newman, in a letter to his bishop, then absent in Rome, had called the promoters of infallibility an insolent and aggressive faction, and had prayed to God to avert from His Church the threatening danger. But surely if the treasures of the Church which had been opened to the faithful by the Pontiff ever yielded a supernatural flow of any grace, it was that of the grace of contradiction, during the Council. The *Weekly Register* declared itself authorised by a personal friend of Dr. Newman to give the most absolute denial to this deliberate fiction. Dr. Newman himself wrote to the *Standard* to deny that he had written to his bishop and called the pro-

¹ VIL, x., 348 ff.

motors of infallibility an insolent and aggressive faction. Yet, after Dr. Newman's method, there were words and words about it. Soon appeared in the *Standard* a second letter from him, confessing that he had been informed from London that several copies of his letter existed in that city, containing the affirmation which he had denied. He now said that, before sending his contradiction, he had looked at the notes of the letter to his bishop, and had not found the words 'insolent and aggressive faction.' But he confessed that since learning that several people in London had those words in their possession, he had looked again and found them. He added that by the faction he did not mean that large number of bishops who had declared in favour of infallibility, nor yet the Jesuits. He meant a collection of persons of different countries, ranks, and conditions in the Church.

The *Civiltá* was careful to remark that Dr. Newman had not withdrawn his offensive words. Others no less remarked that he had never confessed to a single point in his own statement till compelled to do so. He had published a contradiction which to ordinary Englishmen would seem to carry an almost complete denial of the whole allegation. But the *Standard* on April 7th published the following letter, showing that not only the substance of the allegation was correct, but also its details :—

'Rome ought to be a name to lighten the heart at all times, and a Council's proper office is, when some great heresy or other evil impends, to inspire hope and confidence in the faithful; but now we have the greatest meeting which ever has been, and that at Rome, infusing into us by the accredited organs of Rome and of its partisans (such as the *Civiltá*, [the *Armonia*], the *Univers*, and the *Tablet*) little else than fear and dismay. When we are all at rest, and have no doubts, and—at least practically, not to say doctrinally—hold the Holy Father to be infallible, suddenly there is thunder in the clearest sky, and we are told to prepare for something, we know not what, to try our faith, we know not how. No impending danger is to be averted, but a great difficulty is to be created. Is this the proper work of an Ecumenical Council ?

'As to myself personally, please God, I do not expect any trial at all; but I cannot help suffering with the many souls who are suffering, and I look with anxiety at the prospect of having to defend decisions which

may not be difficult to my own private judgment, but may be most difficult to maintain logically in the face of historical facts.

'What have we done to be treated as the faithful never were treated before? When has a definition *de fide* been a luxury of devotion and not a stern, painful necessity? Why should an aggressive, insolent faction be allowed to "make the heart of the just sad, whom the Lord hath not made sorrowful"? Why cannot we be let alone when we have pursued peace and thought no evil?

'I assure you, my lord, some of the truest minds are driven one way and another, and do not know where to rest their feet—one day determining "to give up all theology as a bad job," and recklessly to believe henceforth almost that the Pope is impeccable, at another tempted to "believe all the worst which a book like *Janus* says," others doubting about "the capacity possessed by bishops drawn from all corners of the earth to judge what is fitting for European society," and then, again, angry with the Holy See for listening to "the flattery of a clique of Jesuits, Redemptorists, and converts."

'Then, again, think of the store of pontifical scandals in the history of eighteen centuries, which have partly been poured forth and partly are still to come. What Murphy inflicted upon us in one way M. Veuillot is indirectly bringing on us in another. And then again the blight which is falling upon the multitude of Anglican Ritualists, etc., who themselves perhaps—at least their leaders—may never become Catholics, but who are leavening the various English denominations and parties (far beyond their own range) with principles and sentiments tending towards their ultimate absorption into the Catholic Church.

'With these thoughts ever before me, I am continually asking myself whether I ought not to make my feelings public; but all I do is to pray those early doctors of the Church, whose intercession would decide the matter (Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome, Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Basil), to avert this great calamity.

'If it is God's will that the Pope's infallibility be defined, then is it God's will to throw back "the times and moments" of that triumph which He has destined for His kingdom, and I shall feel I have but to bow my head to His adorable, inscrutable providence.

'You have not touched upon the subject yourself, but I think you will allow me to express to you feelings which, for the most part, I keep to myself. . . .'

This letter could not, because of Dr. Newman's reputation, be passed over in silence. The *Civiltà* well knew how to utilise that reputation, yet it indicates by its mode of dealing with him that it does not set Dr. Newman so high, either intellectually or morally, as his own countrymen do. It treated the whole affair

as a temptation of one of a pious imagination but a sickly judgment. The temptation was one peculiar to Englishmen—it was low spirits. An Englishman labouring under that temptation would read the *Civiltá*, the *Armonia*, the *Univers*, etc., with sombre-coloured spectacles. It was a disease in the eyes. Those affected by it looked upon the definition of a verity as a scourge of God, an affliction not merited! Still, as Dr. Newman did not for himself fear it, he would be able to explain it to others. But the definition of a truth was to prove a blight for the poor Anglican Ritualists :—

'Do you not perceive that it is only temptation that makes you see everything black? . . . If the holy doctors whom you invoke, Ambrose, Jerome, etc., do not decide the controversy in your way, it is not, as the Protestant *Pall Mall Gazette* fancies, because they will not or cannot interpose, but because they agree with St. Peter and with the petition of the majority. . . . Would you have us make processions in sackcloth and ashes to avert this scourge of the definition of a verity? And if it is defined, when the Fathers chant *Te Deum* will some of you intone the *Miserere*? On the contrary, you too will applaud it. . . . Dupanloup will not merely be resigned, he will be a champion of infallibility, and we shall all together say, Amen, hallelujah! and it also will be a hymn like the song in the Apocalypse. . . . Get rid of this ugly melancholy temptation. It makes you lose your logic and your English good sense. Even the Protestant journals teach you better, and as one devil cast out another, a Protestant article may serve to cast out a temptation.'

The compassionate Jesuits of the *Civiltá* then proceed to cast the one devil out of Dr. Newman by the aid of two others, which are respectively the *Pall Mall Gazette* and the *Manchester Examiner and Times*,—the former in an appearance of April 8th, the latter in an appearance of April 9th. Lest this exorcism should not suffice, it calls to its aid seven other spirits equally evil—the *Times*, the *Saturday Review*, the *Telegraph*, the *Daily News*, the *Spectator*, the *Standard*, and the *Echo*. All these, fallen angels though they were, had agreed in the opinion that a religious truth had better be told than hidden, and that a Church which had an infallible head ought to know it. Though on this one point right, these Protestant journals had, however, held up the letter of Dr. Newman as a proof of internal division

underlying a vaunted unity. But in this they were illogical. With this boast the *Civiltá* fitly couples a declaration of Dr. Newman, in which the tortured spirit, whose piercing cry had reached the ear of the world through thick walls, and had been identified in spite of artful windings, puts on, in presence of Protestants, another voice, wishing them to become partakers of its satisfaction and repose!! M. Veuillot was not the man tamely to find himself coupled with Mr. Murphy by one like Dr. Newman, whom, if repute in England set extravagantly high, certainly he did not. He told how the *Univers* had begged four thousand pounds for Dr. Newman and sent it to him, on the occasion when he was cast in damages for a libel on Achilli, an ex-censor of the press, at Viterbo, who had become a Protestant :—

‘The respectable convict,’ says Veuillot, ‘received it and was pleased, but he gave no thanks and showed no courtesy. Father Newman ought to be more careful in what he says ; everything that is comely demands it of him. But, at any rate, if his Liberal passion carries him away till he forgets what he owes to us and to himself, what answer must one give him, but that he had better go on as he set out, silently ungrateful?’¹

Such were the inhospitable jets spouted out upon Dr. Newman by the floundering creature on the back of which the twice ‘credulous mariner’ had pitched his tent. Englishmen may smile at finding Dr. Newman aspersed with the reproach of Liberalism. His puerile spite at the very name of it, as shown in his writings, thus found its Nemesis. M. Veuillot, by a link of connection which is not obvious, confesses that he too, in youth and inexperience, indulged in dreams of peace. But his mature ideas were ruled by a manlier spirit. ‘I dream of a long war—long, hot, inexorable, and one that will change the face of the world.’

For some time past the Orientals had been receiving and giving cause for solicitude. The incident already related of the Chaldean Patriarch was but a symptom of general uneasiness. The Pontiff had resolved on abrogating the old right of electing

¹ Vol. ii., pp. 31-34.

bishops, under which the communities nominated three persons, of whom the Patriarch instituted the one whom he preferred. We have seen how the Chaldean Patriarch was overcome. Jussef, the Melchite Patriarch, refused to surrender his rights, and it is said that, in an audience before other Orientals, the Pope went so far as to seize him by the shoulders.¹ The Syrian Patriarch, on receiving the Pope's command, had taken to his bed, and had not yet answered. The Maronite Patriarch had refused his consent, and had, notwithstanding repeated invitations, stayed in Antioch, instead of coming on to the Council.

The Armenians, however, excited more attention than all the others. Their Patriarch, Hassun, had, some time before, surrendered his rights, and while, in consequence, rising high in favour with the Curia, had incurred ill-will among his own people. Rome, taking advantage of his concessions, had made new and exorbitant claims, on which the yoke of the Papacy was thrown off. Imperative orders to submit were disregarded. A special commissioner was sent from Rome to allay the disturbance, but his success was very limited.

For some time rumours had been floating about the city that two Oriental bishops had been thrown into prison. These changed to rumours of an arrest, and an escape. At last the *Univers*² published an account, stating that the theologian attached to an Armenian bishop had used such language respecting the authorities, that Cardinal Barnabò, Prefect of the Propaganda, had ordered him to the Convent of the Passionists. But he refused to go in such terms that the Cardinal Vicar was obliged to employ force. The theologian was then taken from the residence of the bishop, and put into a vehicle. He was, however, so violent that the 'agents' let him escape into the house again, and though they there attempted a second time to take him, they finally gave way before the opposition of the bishop.

At the same time, the *Univers* mentions 'a much graver

¹ *Tagebuch*, p. 344.

² *Ibid.* p. 304.

fact.' The Pontiff had ordered an apostolic visitation of the convent of the Armenians, which stands just behind the Colonnade of St. Peter's. The twelve who once walked among men with the humble name of apostles, would have little thought that an apostolic visitation should come to mean an inspection by an officer of the King and Pontiff of Rome. The Bishop Ksagian (*sic*) refused to receive the visitor. The Pope ordered the bishop to the Convent of St. Sabina. The bishop, however, refused to go, and appealed to Bishop Place, of Marseilles, to procure French protection for him.

Ce Qui se Passe au Concile (p. 144) says that Bahtiaran, an Armenian Archbishop, had his Vicar-General with him, against whom some one informed, as having spoken with hostility of Hassun, the Romanised Patriarch whom we have just mentioned, and of Valerga, the so-called Patriarch of Jerusalem. Cardinal Barnabò ordered the Vicar-General to a Jesuit convent, but the Archbishop insisted that he would not allow him to go, except upon a written order from the Pope himself. We are not sure whether this represents the first scene in the account of the *Univers*.

Some days afterwards, proceeds *Ce Qui se Passe au Concile*, as Bahtiaran was going to say Mass, his Vicar-General followed him, carrying the missal, accompanied by another Armenian priest. In the street the Archbishop passed through a group of police, headed by an officer. They seized the two priests who were walking behind him, and dragged them to a vehicle. The Orientals valiantly defended themselves, and a struggle ensued. Hearing cries, the Archbishop turned back, and saw his Vicar-General down, and the missal on the ground being trampled upon. He rushed forward, pointing to the book, and crying, 'It is the Gospel: it is the Gospel of Christ! Do you treat the Gospel like that?' The officer did not dare to do violence to the Archbishop, who managed to carry off his Vicar-General, and that day both of them took refuge in the Armenian Convent. It would seem that now followed the

order for a visitation of the convent, which Archbishop Casangian (as this account correctly gives the name and title) resisted; and he, in turn, received an order to go to a convent for 'retirement.' It is even said that leave to quit Rome was refused by the police to all the Armenians, not excepting a bishop who was furnished with a medical certificate that it was necessary for his health.

The *Civiltá* and the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis* do not mention the arrests. The one says that Kasangian, as they spell his name, was Abbot-General by arbitrary election, the other that he was so by tolerance of the Pope. The visitation was first attempted by a Passionist Father, delegated by Pluym, a bishop *in partibus*, who had been by the Pope appointed Visitor-General of the Order. The attempt was resisted. The document which gives to Pluym his powers, calmly says that '*power divinely conferred resides in the Pope of loosing, by his sentence, the things bound by sentence of any judges whomsoever.*'¹ The disobedient Archbishop and the local Abbot were both ordered to another convent, *for spiritual exercises*, as long as the Pope should appoint. They both refused to go. Fresh letters gave the powers of visitor to no less a person than Valenziani, the bishop who in the Council read the Decrees. These letters declared Archbishop Kasangian deposed from the office of Abbot-General of the Order; declared the office of the Abbot of the monastery vacant, and all other offices within it whatsoever; declared that no authority existed in that house but what flowed from Valenziani, and declared that all pains and penalties he might impose should be ratified.

So armed, Valenziani presented himself with consummate address and admirable suavity. Even according to the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, he declared that his visitation had no object but to lead the Armenians to fulfil their duty. But the Orientals knew the double tongue. In his own words, they lent no obedient ear. Others say that they would not allow the Pope's

¹ *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, v., 447.

brief to be read. Defied and defeated in the very 'street of the Holy Office,' Valenziani had the once terrible interdict fastened to the door of the rebellious convent. It was owing, says the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, to the clemency of the Holy See that the severest punishment, such as was due to the offence, was not inflicted.¹ Others told of different causes.

The protection of France being refused to the Armenians, the strange spectacle was seen, as Vitelleschi puts it, of brethren in Christ being forced to seek protection against His Vicar from a Turk (p. 130). Rustum Bey, the Ottoman ambassador, came from Florence, and, it is said, was not well received by Antonelli, who gave him to understand that, in Rome, all priests were subjects of the Pope. But the ambassador would not waive the rights of the Porte, which, he alleged, was obliged to show favour to the Armenians, to prevent them from throwing themselves into the arms of Russia. The day of unity had not yet dawned. The poor world had still to suffer from more heads than one. Finally, after specious attempts of the authorities to get the Armenians into their power, and wonderful wariness and dexterity on the part of the Orientals, one morning the convent behind the colonnades of St. Peter's was found empty—not the first time that a convent had been left empty in Rome. The monks had somehow managed to take their flight from a spot only a few yards from the Inquisition and within rifle shot of scores of convents,—in which 'retirement' for 'religious exercises,' might have been, for them, a very serious matter. It is said that, before the flight, Rustum Bey told the monks, in case of need, to hoist the Turkish flag, and threatened that, if any harm was done to them, reprisals should be taken on Romish convents in Turkey. Indeed, M. Veuillot goes so far as to assert that they actually did hoist the Turkish flag, and also the French. He says that they executed the sentence of excommunication upon themselves (ii., 87). If they did hoist the Turkish flag, it would have been a curious sight

¹ *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, vol. v., 501-507.

to see the two emblems of religion and physical force which still survive in Europe—the crescent, and the keys and tiara—floating side by side, close by the prisons of the Inquisition and the circus where Nero gave to unity by physical force, his pontifical sanction. It was asserted that attempts were made to put the Armenian Archbishop of Tarsis also into ‘retirement.’¹

The exaggerated rumours afloat regarding espionage would be stimulated by anecdotes like the above. It seems to have been agreed, on all hands, that during the Council the force detailed for that important duty had been increased manifold. Friedrich mentions one Papal officer who said that out of every fifty persons fifteen were spies. He gave examples of people now living handsomely who were known to have nothing. One Marchese had set up his carriage. Why, Friedrich says, even the train-bearer of a Cardinal will give a dinner to the train-bearers of the other Cardinals in order to spy them out. He naturally enough remarks that a historian learns a good deal by finding himself amidst such a state of things. It enables him to understand many things in history. But, strangest of all, reflects the Professor, is it to find people looking on this worn-out system as the model for the whole earth. It is, however, just the fact that such a state of things was looked upon as the model for the whole earth, that gives a deep interest to every trait showing what that state of things really was.

Friedrich, remarking that the Count De Chambord, as a dispossessed prince who expected his throne back from the infallible Pope, very naturally was an Infallibilist, goes on to say that only dispossessed princes are papistically minded. They were nearly all waiting in Rome, and he had reason to know that they expected that the declaration of infallibility, and the things connected therewith, would lead to their restoration, as the Pope certainly expected that it would lead to the recovery of his own States.²

¹ Compare *Tagebuch* (pp. 304, 324, 325, and 344) with *Quirinus* (p. 432) and *Vitelleschi* (p. 130).

² *Tagebuch*, p. 358.

The 24th of April was the day fixed for the third public session. The first had been devoted to the opening ceremony, the second to the swearing of the Creed; but this one was for the promulgation of Decrees. Up to the last it was doubtful whether all the bishops of the minority would adopt the policy recommended by the leaders, not to cause any division into majority and minority till the struggle on infallibility itself came on. Some say that Kenrick and Strossmayer held out so far as to stay away. But Kenrick voted, although, as we have seen, he expressed regret at having yielded to others instead of following his own judgment. The robes for the day were red. The doors of the house were thrown open, and non-members who had a place in the galleries were not required to withdraw at the time when the Rules prescribed that they should do so. Monsignor Guérin says that the crowd was immense: M. Veillot that the meeting was numerous. Vitelleschi declares that there were few people in the church, and that the signs of interest were so faint that the principal impression made upon him by the scene was that of the complete isolation of the assembly from the world, which it was intended to represent. When the Decrees were handed from the throne, Valenziani read them out from the pulpit. Jacobini, the Sub-Secretary, then ascended it, and called out the name of Cardinal Mattei. '*Absent!*' cried a voice from near the throne. '*Absent!*' cried a voice from near the door, at the other end of the Hall. Jacobini then called out '*Constantine, Bishop of Porto;*' and Patrizi, rising, said '*Placet.*' '*Placet,*' cried the voice from near the throne. '*Placet,*' cried the voice from near the door, and the scrutineers and officers registered the vote. It was not long before a test name was called—that of Schwarzenberg, one of the few Cardinals older than the present pontificate. He had already advised the policy of concession for to-day, saying, '*We must not blow our powder away.*' But this was not known to all the majority, and when the magnificent prince pronounced his *Placet*, there was a manifest expression of relief.

what year?

When the Cardinals had all been called the names were no longer repeated—only the title of the See.

Cardinal Manning relates how diplomatists, who had hoped to see division, were struck as they looked from their galleries, and saw the leaders of the Opposition, one after another, stand up and pronounce their *Placet*. Friedrich says that the countenances of the Jesuits changed from gloom to delight, when Schwarzenberg, Hohenlohe, Darboy, and others, gave in their votes, and that they manifested a particular interest in that of Hefele. He also says that the gentlemen who were with him in the tribune figuring as theologians, but whom he calls train-bearers, were intensely anxious about the indispensable sunbeams, which, however, he adds, were for that day cut off from the Hall. Just as the Pope entered the assembly, the sunbeams did pass the threshold; and the gentlemen around him cried out, 'The sun, the sun!' their eyes dancing for joy. The editor of the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis* tells how a window in the dome admitted a beam which, while the hymn *Creator Spiritus* was being sung, rested on the word 'Church,' inscribed under the dome, and then disappeared.¹ After the Decrees had been passed, the Pope pronounced a short allocution, rejoicing in their unity, and saying, 'Our Lord Jesus Christ gave peace to His apostles, and I also, who am His unworthy Vicar, in His name give peace to you.' Friedrich says that some French bishops hailed this with clapping of hands, but that, instead of this being general, there were signs of dissatisfaction, and particularly from the galleries. The first statement is confirmed by the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*.

Friedrich could hardly catch the formula in which the Pope announced his passing of the Decrees; but it struck him that it was not the same as that prescribed in the Rules; and on receiving the text as passed, he found that a change had been made without any intimation whatever having been given of it.

¹ He introduces this statement by saying, 'Nolumus heic omittere quandam circumstantiam a nonnullis animadversam' (v. 458).

To him the change was nothing, as the new form only said what he knew the previous one meant, although bishops had seriously differed with him for saying so. The Rules prescribe the formula, 'We decree, enact, and sanction;' and this was now changed to the more compact and expressive Papistical formula, 'We define, and, by apostolic authority, confirm.' The word 'sanction' had a flavour of historic dualism.

The Curialists boasted, after this session, that they had gained three points, and the statement of them shows a clear conception of their own strategy and of the positions to be won:¹ first, the Pope had, for the first time in three hundred and fifty years, proclaimed Decrees in a Council in his own name only, merely mentioning the Council as approving; secondly, the new Rules had been accepted; thirdly, the final clause of the Decrees carried the conclusion that the former dogmatic Decrees of the Popes were accepted as of authority. This last point alone was of prodigious consequence, and vindicates Friedrich's discernment in tracing the Curial system at first sight in these apparently elementary and rather feeble chapters. Only one fortnight earlier, as we have seen, Cardinals and prelates declared that they and the majority of bishops in great nations had taught in direct contradiction to the Bull *Unam Sanctam*. But from to-day both that Bull and, among others, the *Ex Apostolatus Officio* of Paul IV., the father of the Roman Inquisition, were of divine authority! Or as Quirinus puts it, 'Rules of faith for the whole Catholic world, and thus it will be taught universally in Europe and America, henceforth, that the Pope is absolute master in temporal affairs also; that he can order war or peace, and that every monarch or bishop who does not submit to him, or helps any one separated from him, ought to be deprived of his throne, if not of his life' (p. 471).

The Decrees contain eighteen anathemas! Vitelleschi says, that of those in the cathedral who paid any attention to the proceedings, none seemed ever to reflect that, as Catholics, they

¹ *Quirinus*, p. 477.

would lie down that night with new articles of faith and new declarations (anathemas) weighing on their intellect and conscience. ‘Authority’ teaches men to admit new creeds with awful facility, and to utter anathemas almost as readily as a primitive Christian would have said, God bless you! One person, remarks Vitelleschi, did make an observation on this subject, and he was a schismatic Greek. The Catholic, however, to whom his remark was addressed, made an answer which seemed to indicate that the new dogma had not much prospect of being pondered, or the new Decrees much prospect of being observed. Probably that was a Roman, and not improbably his reply would be in the words of a Roman proverb, to the effect that laws were made within the walls to be kept without. But levity of that sort did not alter the facts. The new shades of belief were now to be gradually printed upon every mind in the Catholic world, and the practical points in the new Decrees were to be worked out, through the machinery of Romanism, to the ends of the earth and to the end of time. The Curialists did not exaggerate the substantial victory which had been won, or the practical importance of the three points already specified. The legislative effect of those points upon what little of constitutional arrangements had still been left in the Romish communion, was very great. They linked all the past dogmatic Decrees of the Popes to the authority of the Creator of the world. The unfailing interpreter of the view taken by the Court of the position of affairs, M. Veuillot, says (i., 472), ‘The last paragraph confirms all the Constitutions, and apostolical Decrees, which condemn the errors of the times. Thus have the condemnations pronounced in the Syllabus received the official stamp.’¹

Even the anathemas were pleasant to M. Veuillot’s cultured

¹ The *Oriente*, without naming the Syllabus, asserts that by this paragraph the Council itself has put a new seal on all the acts of the Pontiff condemning erroneous opinions. It says the mouths are shut of those sowers of tares who would pretend that opinions not branded as heresies were left free by the Council, because not separately named (VII., x., 524).

taste. ‘ You have read the eighteen anathemas against errors pronounced in the old form of the sovereignty of the Church.’ Some had said that there would be no more anathemas, some that they did not want any more. ‘ But there they are, and there they are for eternity. In my view, the work of revolt accomplished during a hundred years, falls smitten with old age’ (ii., 45, 46).

Not long afterwards, chiding the *Figaro*, the *Gaulois*, and other journals, for asking what the Council was doing, he replied, ‘ The Council is making a wide and deep furrow like the grave of a world. You will go down into that furrow, and you will not spring up’ (ii., 58). As to the *plébiscite* then about to be taken in France, he said that he could not vote Yes, because that would be permanently handing oneself over to princes who would not take any engagement to the Church; and he would not say No, for he did not wish to precipitate disasters (ii., 66).

CHAPTER IV.

To the End of the General Debate on the Decrees *De Ecclesia*, June 3rd—Temporal Benefit to the Curia of Spiritual Centralisation—Spalding’s Proposals—Impatience of the Pope and Veuillot—Outcry against *Ce Qui se Passe au Concile*—All other Subjects to be Postponed, and Infallibility to be brought on out of its order—Renewed protest of Minority—Open Change of Dispute from one on Opportuneness to one on the Merits of the Dogma—Anecdotes of Bishops—Violations of Rules—Private Notes of Bishops on the Dogma—Doubts cast on the Authority of the Council—Formula of New Decree—How it will Work.

‘ WHO would not gladly pay a handsome sum to be armed with an infallible decision which will at once crush all opposition and put down all adversaries?’¹ This was the practical question suggested by the speculations of Romans. Having lost many offices and emoluments by political changes, they looked to spiritual centralisation as the happiest resource of the suffering *bureaux*. They had been taught to do so by the experience of many ages. In-

¹ *Quirinus*, p. 482.

creased resort to the oracle would certainly follow the lifting of its Decrees above all dispute, and the extension of its domain at the same time to matters of ordinary and immediate jurisdiction in every diocese, not to speak of the revival of spiritual authority over temporal affairs through the sealing with infallibility of ancient Bulls which had fallen into desuetude. What, indeed, they might well ask, would not a party in some hot dispute pay for a Decree that could never be disturbed? and in high affairs of State, when some Crœsus had set his heart on a great enterprise, would he not make offerings to the oracle, which even a Herodotus might rejoice to immortalise? Moreover, as Quirinus adds, almost every Roman had a brother, an uncle, or a cousin, in the clerical circle around which the profits would be distributed. If bishops, with countries to call their own, feared the result of the attempt to set up clerical authority above civil, Roman prelates who had no country, but were only the political dependents of foreigners, openly declared that they looked upon the restoration of spiritual authority over temporal affairs as the one thing called for by the times. So long as this notion was confined to the Roman prelates proper, one could comprehend it. They had lived apart from men and affairs, except their own affairs, and were absolute strangers to the actual age and world. But that bishops from free countries or great ones should entertain such dreams, or while not themselves sharing in the illusions, should adopt the religious expedients by which it was hoped to give them effect, is marvellous. Perhaps it may be partly explained by that weakening of the individual conscience and will, through the principle of authority, to which Vitelleschi so instructively refers; by that complete personal dependence of bishops on the Curia for consideration, and even for means, which is noted on all hands; by the unbroken habit of yielding to Rome, or of being beaten in every attempt at resistance; by old age, and by the incurable isolation of the men themselves from humanity. They were men bound, as

we view it, only by artificial ties, to a guild bent upon ruling the world, while they themselves received gold rings and goodly apparel for bearing their share in the enterprise. Or, as they viewed it, they were men separated from the world, identified only with the Church and the clergy, and utterly dependent upon the Vicar of God. What could they do? A quarrel with a government had hitherto always brought a bishop glory, but not so a quarrel with the Curia. In the former case, the Pope took care to make up to the bishop in professional advantage more than he could lose by political collision. In the latter case, no government could or would make up to him for disgrace or ruin. A martyr bishop was one of the most effective figures in every Church display. A great occasion would be comparatively dull without one. Governments could make no such use of bishops who might suffer for loyalty.

It is curious to find in the Archbishop of Baltimore one of the keenest partisans of infallibility. Formerly, Dr. Spalding had foretold that the dogma would only occasion difficulties, and had advised resistance. The causes of his new zeal were of course discussed in Rome, where changes of opinion are liable to be assigned to personal rather than to public motives. Spalding prepared a formula of infallibility to the effect that all Papal decisions must be received with internal assent. It is even said that he took this for a mild form compared with the direct declaration of the doctrine. Two of his American colleagues, on the other hand, the Archbishops of St. Lewis and of Cincinnati, bore a distinguished part among the prelates of the minority, as did also the Archbishop of Halifax.¹ Kenrick, of St. Lewis, left an impression of force equalled only by few prelates in the assembly.

The question of infallibility had been a good while in the hands of the committee before the latter gave any sign of being ready with the formula. Some thought that the com-

¹ *Quirinus*, p. 253.

mittee was not unwilling to let time pass before forcing matters to an issue. The minority had now become anxious for delay, in the hope that the dreaded Chapter XI. would not be brought on before the heats of the Roman summer should disperse the Council. They had the whole of the Decrees on the Duty of Bishops, on the Life of the Clergy, on the Catechism, and ten chapters of the Decree on the General Constitution of the Church, to discuss before the critical eleventh chapter would come on. But the confessions of the Masonic agent, already referred to, showed that these hopes of delay on the part of the minority were perfectly understood by the Curia. It was determined not to let the patience of the majority be worn out. The impatience of men like Mermillod may be imagined when even Bishop Martin is quoted by Friedrich as expressing a wish that the Garibaldians would come and scatter the Council. But most impatient of all was the Pontiff. Briefs and speeches equally tingled with the same excitement. M. Veuillot found it necessary to declare that the Pope was not impatient, but resolute. Still he let it out that something had been hoped for even at the last public session (ii., 45). The voice of the people crying, 'The Infallible Pope for ever,' had sounded in Veuillot's ears during the Easter festivities, and again on the anniversary of the return from exile. But when, oh when would the voice of God sound? Pius IX. would know God's moment, and would take it. As to the cries which nourished the faith of M. Veuillot, the deaf ears of Quirinus and Friedrich heard only faint ones—two voices or three. These writers, at least one or other of them, suggested a calculation as to how many *baiocchi*, or halfpence, the cries cost.

The mission of Pius IX. was but half fulfilled. He had secured the Immaculate Conception, but not yet the Infallibility; and this was to be, and it must be soon. What Quirinus says (p. 526) of the Pope's two fixed ideas is in harmony with the general belief; they were, first, a persuasion of the

Th.

w it, o
rld, v
appar
view
ied or
lent v
al wi
glo
r ca
ofess
ion.
e up
of t
reat
ern
er t
t is
ke
lf
L
e
o

centralisation. But, it may be asked, Was not the Council in possession of a subject after it had once been proposed and discussed? The reply must be, No, for such subjects could be withdrawn from its cognizance at any moment without its leave.

The new tactical movement for postponing all the subjects having precedence of infallibility struck the minority with dismay. Not having courage to fight for themselves, they would have gone on reading speeches or writing protests, and hoping that time would do the fighting for them, and that thus they should never reach the eleventh chapter. But having to contend with men who understood the value of measures, they saw their hopes of escape by effluxion of time cut off. Had they at first insisted on Rules of Procedure proper to a free assembly, they would have had a hold of subjects which had been once proposed, as well as of a hundred coignes of vantage. But they had let all that slip away at the Pro-Synodal Congregation and at the first Session.

No sooner were the minority aware of the intention to take the discussion on infallibility out of its order, than they resolved on sending a solemn deputation direct to the Pope to make urgent representations. Purcell, Archbishop of Cincinnati, was to be the spokesman.¹ But this movement was forestalled by one from the other side. The *Synopsis of Notes*, written by the Fathers upon the Dogma, was suddenly distributed. This not only marked the resolution of the Curia to press forward, but it accomplished a step in the progress. Either from discouragement, or from a calculation of the futility of the step, the bishops allowed their intended deputation to fall through. They resorted once more to a paper protest, which was signed by sixty-six prelates.² The true spirit of an Oriental Court made them conscious that a petition and a surrender were the measures of

¹ *Quirinus*, p. 508.

² *Quirinus* says by seventy-seven; but we give the numbers as we count them at the foot of the document in the *Documenta ad Illustrandum*, ii., p. 392.

which they were capable. In fact, as will presently appear, they had passed the stage even of petitioning, and had come to that of hopeless complaint.

As if to console themselves by strong words for doing nothing, they recalled the fact that as soon as the *Civiltá* hinted that the work of the Council was to be the proclamation of infallibility, all the enemies of the Church had exclaimed that the Holy Father, after having made a pretext of the general good, had really convoked the bishops for his own exaltation. This they had then treated as a calumny. But if the weighty matters already laid before the Council were to be put aside, and nothing was to result from their labours during six or seven months but the one Decree already adopted, with the second now proposed on infallibility, they would find on returning home that those calumnies against the Church would have acquired life and force such as they could not contemplate without deep sorrow.

The sixty-six bishops formally announce that they do *not make any request*. They simply state their convictions. Again, to prefer requests would, they feel, be no longer consistent with their episcopal dignity, with their position, or their rights, as members of the Council, since they have already learned sufficiently, and more than sufficiently, by experience that any prayers of theirs are so far from being granted that they are not even answered. Wherefore, they add, in words such as have seldom been laid at the foot of any throne by an equal number of nobles of a realm—yet, we ought not to say, laid at the foot of the throne, for they had not the heart to address their deaf sovereign again, but addressed his delegates, the Presiding Cardinals :—

‘ Nothing now remains to us but to disclaim for ourselves, as far as may be, all accountability before men, and before the dreadful judgment-seat of God, for the ill-omened events which, beyond all doubt, will soon arise, and indeed are already arising; and of this our disclaimer the present document will abide the perpetual witness.

‘ If the Decree to be pronounced *De Ecclesia*,’ proceeds this striking memorial of the transition stage from the position of ancient Catholic

bishops to that of mere Papal prefects,—‘If the Decree to be pronounced *De Ecclesia*, putting aside controverted points, aimed only at displaying to the eyes of all men the beauty and majesty of the Spouse of Christ to the greater glory of God and the salvation of souls, how easily might we set forth the whole of the doctrine of the Church ; and, perhaps, we might all on the approaching festival of Pentecost, wherein the foundation of the Church is annually called to mind, celebrate it together. Then indeed would a right solemn Pentecost shine upon our Synod, whereof the splendour streaming over the entire world would fill all Christians with mighty gladness. But, alas ! so far is such gladness from being granted to us, that it would appear that on the approaching Pentecost we must look forward rather to a day of mourning than to one of joy. The accountability for this would rest on those who—no necessity of the Christian commonwealth demanding it—would, by means of the Council, wave the victor’s palm because certain opinions of the schools had triumphed, not over the enemies of the Church, but over brothers, and who would thus inflict the gravest injury upon the Church ; injury which, both at the present time and in view of the circumstances of future times, would give cause for abiding fear and pain of heart.’

‘May it please the almighty and merciful God to avert so great an evil from the Vatican Council, and to lead us all by His heavenly grace to a sense of true concord and unity !’

Among those who sign are Prague, Munich, Colocza, Cologne, St. Gall, Maintz, Halifax, Clifton, St. Louis, Paris, St. Augustine in Florida, Cincinnati, Chatham, Plymouth, Kerry, Milan, and Sault St. Marie in Michigan.

For us it is hard to account for the fact that language so strong, from men representing interests so large, should be deemed not even worthy of the courtesy of an answer. Why did the bishops not go to the Pope directly ?

‘Sad as it is to confess it,’ says *La Liberté du Concile*, ‘the Pope does not easily grant audiences to bishops of the minority. Many have been expressly solicited, as to which up to this hour no reply has been received. We know several of the oldest and most respected bishops of France, who have been six months in Rome, and have not yet been admitted to the presence of the Pope. Of those who have been admitted, to none, with two or three exceptions, has the Pope given any opening for conversation on the concerns of the Church, or for exchanging a single word with the Holy Father on the position of affairs.’

Quirinus represents the Roman prelates as saying that the

¹ *Doc. ad Ill.*, i., 178.

German bishops at Fulda had already showed that they felt how unity was to be preferred to veracity. Thus the Curia had implicit faith in the feebleness of conviction, compared with the force of the habit of submission. Only two things would they have feared—a schism on the part of the bishops, or a separation of the Church from the State on the part of the politicians. But they confidently reckoned on the submission of the one, and on the political calculations of the other.

The pretext that all the objections to infallibility related only to opportuneness, had been gradually dropped. In fact, neither side could keep it up, even before the public. It was possible to conceal most of the speeches, and to deny everything that was reported of them ; and it was hoped that the secret petitions would never see the light, but tracts and pamphlets could not be so readily hidden. So the Jesuits at last boldly turned round and accused the opponents of attacking the doctrine itself. *Observationes Quædem de Infallibilitatis Ecclesiae Subjecto* is the title of one publication, in treating of which the *Civiltà* said that opportuneness no longer related to the character of the times, but to the character of the doctrine. The doctrine itself was declared to be alien from Catholic tradition,—a new doctrine, and consequently a false one.¹ Ketteler had brought a pamphlet to Rome, in Latin, composed under his authority. It was long detained by the police, but, after vexatious delays, was released. One of the things which exposed him to the charge of being double-faced was the fact that he ‘ hawked’ this pamphlet about among the bishops, and yet said that it attacked only the opportuneness of the definition.² Hefele said, ‘ You are a Rhine Frank, and the Rhine Franks are clever people. I am only a Swabian, and I cannot see it.’

As Bishops Krementz and Namszanowski left Friedrich on April 25th, they met Bishop Martin. He told them with delight how the King of Prussia, their own monarch, had written to

¹ Serie VII., x., p. 291.

² Printed in *Documenta ad Ill.*, i., p. 1-129.

* which year?

Rauscher laughed at.

291

his ambassador not to trouble himself further with the decisions of the Council. Martin extolled the king to the skies, and declared that he would now make a Prussian Propaganda. But Namzanowski replied, 'If that is your idea, you are greatly mistaken. The king at first believed that in Rome one had to do with reasonable and sensible men; but now, seeing that he was misled, he says, "Do what you like, and we shall let you do it quietly. If you adopt conclusions which are injurious to us, we shall draw the sword." That is the language which the consciousness of power inspires.'¹

The Congregation of April 29th was occupied in discussing the Decree on the Catechism. Hefele read a speech of Rauscher. The Cardinal affirmed that, according to the Concordat, the Catechism in Austria could not be changed without the consent of the government. He demanded therefore that the new Catechism should not be declared obligatory. The majority burst out into loud laughter. Hefele looked firmly and indignantly at the disturbers. The noise ceased, and he proceeded. A second time the laughter occurred. At the conclusion, he went to the Presidents and complained. One of them observed that as a historian he must know that even at Trent there had been interruptions. Yes, he said, but he did not know that interruptions were essential to a Council; and he would call attention to the fact that such proceedings would cause the freedom of the Council to be called in question, and possibly its oecumenicity.²

A Roman Dominican, unable to comprehend how prelates could look on the proposed measure as fraught with danger, told with wonder how, on the night when the Draft of the Decree on Infallibility was distributed, he had heard a French

¹ *Tagebuch*, p. 365. Friedrich adds a note to his second edition:—'Bishop Namzanowski had this statement denied in the *Germania* of 1872, No. 132. This is really disgusting. I declare here, as I have done already in the *Cologne Gazette*, that the Bishop himself told me in his own house immediately after the meeting with Martin. I was so struck with the expression that I entered it under the heading, "Certain Notes touching Rome and the Council."

² *Ibid.*, p. 380; *La Liberté du Concile*, Doc. i., p. 173.

bishop repeatedly sigh, and over and over again exclaim, ‘My poor France! my poor France!’¹ The Protestant Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, who visited Cardinal Hohenlohe at his magnificent Villa d’Este, which from the heights of Tivoli overlooks the Roman plain, asked Friedrich if the Syllabus was really confirmed by the closing portion of the Decree on Faith, at the promulgation of which the Grand Duke had been present. Friedrich does not say how he answered, but remarks that the impression thus indicated was universal.² On the 2nd of May, as afterwards appeared by a letter found among papers in the Tuileries, Darboy was writing to Napoleon III. stating that the minority was compact, would do its utmost, and did not despair of victory.³ On May 4th the Council came to a vote on the Catechism, when as many as a hundred voted *Non placet*. Then occurred a recess of several days; but twenty-four French bishops put in that day a protest against arbitrary violations of those very Rules which had been imposed upon the Council by the Pope himself. In the late public session the Rule that non-members should be excluded during the legislative acts had been departed from without the Council being consulted. Further, this day, they add, when the votes on various amendments to the Decree on the Catechism had been taken, the Rule required that the vote on the whole should be deferred to another day. But, against the Rule, it was taken on the spot. Several Fathers, who had counted that the Rule would be kept, were absent. It is further alleged that no opportunity of pointing out these irregularities was given; because, say they, contrary to the rule of all deliberative bodies, it is not allowed in the Council to speak even to order, unless the name of the speaker has been inscribed the day before, which of course is impossible in unforeseen circumstances.⁴

During the recess the Fathers could study the contents of the notes on infallibility. The Synopsis of them, as we have already

¹ *Tagebuch*, p. 369.

² *Ibid.*, p. 370.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 371.

⁴ *Documenta*, ii., p. 391.

mentioned, had been put into their hands. Some of these notes are printed entire, some are abridged; but there does not appear to have been much complaint that this was unfairly done. The two sides were represented by about an equal number of memoranda. The Synopsis contained two hundred and forty-two pages, consisting of one hundred and thirty-nine memoranda. Sixty-five of these were adverse to the definition. Of these, again, only thirteen advanced merely the plea of inopportuneness, and fifty-two opposed the doctrine itself. Yet Cardinal Manning never heard of five bishops who denied the doctrine of Papal infallibility!¹

Adepts readily traced many of the anonymous memoranda to their authors, and, of course, the authors frequently acknowledged their handiwork. The first memorandum was by Rauscher, the last by Kenrick—two men who showed as much capacity as any of the minority. In these notes, the student will find a real source of light on the thoughts and principles which were then common to all the men convened to reconstitute human society, as well as on those in which they disagreed.² They are almost the only portion of the proceedings which have real interest for the pure theologian. Attempts have been made since the Council, by many bishops, to represent the whole amount of difference of opinion as having been a trifle, touching only the question of opportuneness. The character of those statements is sealed by these notes. We shall not attempt to give a general outline of them; but the very first memorandum, that of Rauscher, is perfectly explicit. He immediately handles the doctrine, not the prudence or expedience of proclaiming it. It was fair to treat an objector like Dr. Newman as opposing, on grounds not either theological or moral, but from subtle expediency. Such men were simply afraid of hurting the credit of their Church, though admitting that the claims she advanced were warranted. They counselled a reserve which would have been thought

¹ *Pet. Priv.*, iii., p. 27.

² *Documenta*, ii., 212-289.

natural for Italians, but impossible for Englishmen, before the time when Dr. Newman's power of making the flow of our mother tongue smooth and winning began to be used, in order to rob it of its good name for straightforwardness. But Rauscher showed cause. He declared that it had never yet been proved that the alleged authority which the new claims professed to formulate, had any existence. He declared that the attempts made to prove it were partly artifices and partly fallacies. Two positions so distinct as this simple one of Rauscher and the double one of Newman could not be confounded, even by men much less apt at splitting hairs than Roman Catholic bishops.

'The subterfuges,' indignantly writes Rauscher in his first paragraph, after alluding to the necessity, under which he lay in Germany, of showing reasons, and tacitly contrasting such a position with the facility of demanding submission in Rome,—'The subterfuges employed by not a few theologians in the matter of Honorius, would expose me to derision. To employ sophisms seems to me unworthy both of the dignity of a bishop and of the nature of the subject, which ought to be treated in the fear of God; but prudence itself would put me on my guard against artifices.' He then alludes to that battle with which *we* are familiar—the battle of conflicting thoughts, out of which only the immortal emerge unhurt. He felt that he had to wage this battle, not like his Roman masters, who had but to speak and it was thought by all their lieges, if not done by all the earth. If, exclaims Rauscher, it proved in these combats that I had taken refuge in artifices, enemies would triumph. What a testimony! delivered in the face of Rome at that moment, it showed the effect of free enquiry in compelling men to be truthful, as compared with the effect of what Rome calls 'authority' in making them first supple and then deceitful. It is a testimony of permanent value in the three spheres of history, morals, and theology.

His next blow is at a logical trick, which, however, is one

employed by Roman Catholic theologians at almost every step in their attempt to prove Romanist as distinguished from Christian doctrine—the trick of begging the question. It is inferred that the Decrees of the Pope, in matters of faith and morals, must be infallible, because the power of legislation in faith and morals for the whole Church having been conferred on Peter and his successors, it is clear that what was false could not be allowed to enter into such Decrees. Very good, says Rauscher; but this is calling the thing to be proved to give evidence for the thing to be proved. The question turns on the very point whether any such power of universal legislation, in faith or morals, without appeal or revision, ever was conferred on Peter and his successors. Even here Rauscher assumes as proved what is altogether incapable of proof, that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Peter. That Peter ever was in Rome is not proven; that he ever was Pontiff is absurd; that he ever was the Christian bishop of the city admits of scarcely a show of proof, except on those principles of evidence which have been naturalised in Romish theology by the necessity of supporting fables and forgeries.

Not only do men like Rauscher show that they dispute the doctrine itself, but the memoranda of many who commence by alleging inopportuneness, end by attacking the substance of the doctrine. For instance, No. 136 says, ‘Finally, I cannot find this infallibility in the acts of the General Councils. On the other hand, it is certain that three General Councils condemned Honorius for heresy.’ Yet this prelate seemed, in his first sentences, only to oppose the opportuneness of the definition. Kenrick takes the opposite course. He begins by saying that the doctrine is not so certain that it can be defined as an article of faith, and then takes up lower ground, that, even if it were certain, it would not be expedient that it should be defined by the present Council. We do not wonder at any man who could put upon paper the last principle, submitting to anything, or concealing anything, or professing anything, if it is expedient.

What, it may be true that, on earth, God has set up a man as His representative who, whenever he puts on his full official character, utters the Word of God without error or possibility of erring, and yet it may not be expedient to tell this most pregnant of truths by any and every organ possible! How can any moral foundations exist in men whose whole substance is honeycombed by principles like these? When they submit, their submission has not the grace of any real sacrifice. When they affirm, their affirmation has not the authority of any real conviction. Even in the paltry affairs of our money market, what should we say of a man who, knowing that God had sent one among us with an infallible judgment as to sound or unsound investments, should admit that it might not be expedient to make the portent and the mission known, because, assuredly, some banks would break, and some respected financiers would be ruined?

This moral obscurity does not prevent Kenrick from clearly seeing theological points. He boldly says that the doctrine expressed in the proposed definition is wanting in authority both from Scripture and from ecclesiastical tradition. We shall not enter into his examination of the alleged scriptural proofs, but it is well worth the attention of theologians. He clearly puts the retrospective and prospective aspects of the new dogma, when contrasting it with an ordinary point of doctrine like that of the Immaculate Conception :—

‘The new dogma not only impairs the rights of bishops, but imposes on the faithful the necessity of believing that the Roman Pontiffs never did err in faith, which indubitable monuments of history seem to disprove; and that they never will err in the future, which we hope, but are not able to believe with the certitude of divine faith.’¹

Kenrick says that, in defining the Immaculate Conception, the Pope proposed the greater glory of the Mother of God, and previously to doing so consulted all the bishops, and acted on their advice. Now, however, he proposed his own infallibility, to be defined by a Council, which seems to have been convened

¹ *Documenta*, ii., 287.

for that purpose, although many bishops, and those representing the principal Churches of the Christian world, do not approve of it either in itself or in its concomitants.

Kenrick embraces under the head of expediency matter very different indeed from what one would have anticipated. He barely indicates the social and political dangers likely to arise out of the contemplated changes in dogma and polity. Having done this, he at once declares that the authority and cœcumnicity of the Council are liable to be called in question, and will be called in question, on two separate grounds: first, the composition of the Council, and, secondly, its defect of liberty. As to its composition, he divides the members of it into five classes:—

1. Diocesan bishops having Sees and governing them by ordinary episcopal authority.
2. Bishops of the *Ring*—*episcopi annulares*—who have the orders of bishops, but have neither Sees nor flocks, and who, with few exceptions, hold offices in the Court of Rome.
3. Other bishops *in partibus*, who, under the designation of Vicars Apostolic, preside over missions, and are all of them so immediately dependent upon the Holy See as to be removable at the discretion of the Pope.
4. Cardinals who are not bishops, and Cardinals who, having the orders of bishops, have no Sees.
5. Abbots and Generals of Orders.

Kenrick asserts that out of all the five classes the right of definition in matters of faith belongs, by a certain and universally acknowledged title, to diocesan bishops alone. The right of the Bishops of the Ring to define in matters of faith is a subject of dispute among theologians. The right of the Vicars Apostolic is disputable, but on different grounds. They have Sees, yet they are immediately dependent on the See of Rome, even to the extent of being removable at the will of the Bishop of Rome. As to Cardinals who are not bishops, with the Abbots and Generals, there is no doubt. They are confessed by all to

have no right of definition in matters of faith, except as derived from custom.

Having thus described the composition of the Council, he adds the following solemn words :—

‘ In this Council the subject in hand affects the conflicting claims of the Pope and the bishops. If the Pope alone is infallible, the bishops do not exercise the office of judges, and, in a Council, they are only his councillors. Hence it ought to belong not to the Pope singly, but to a Council of diocesan bishops presided over by the Pope, to determine what right properly belongs to the other four classes ; for otherwise the Pope would seem to dominate the Council.’

How that argument to prove that the proper constitution of a Council was violated at the Vatican is to be met, it is not easy to see. The point next touched by Kenrick is one that has been less dwelt upon in public, but which would probably have some weight in a legal argument. In the Bull of Convocation it was enjoined upon bishops who should not be able to attend, to send their deputies furnished with proper credentials. Forty such deputies actually presented themselves ; they were refused admittance, not by the Council, but by the Pope acting alone ! Now, insists Kenrick, diocesan bishops would appear to have a strict right to send deputies to the Council when themselves unable to attend, which right was recognised by the ancient Councils. The exclusion, therefore, of those deputies from the Vatican Council *by the sole authority of the Pontiff*, would seem to raise a doubt of its œcumnicity. Had there been any question as to their title, it belonged to the Council itself to determine, but permission was not given to take the opinion of the Council on the point !

Kenrick further specifies, as a blot upon the authority and œcumnicity of the Council, the withdrawal from the bishops of the right of proposition by a mere Papal constitution. He adds the important fact that, owing to the privation of this right, many Fathers who wished to take the opinion of the Council on the admission of the deputies of absent prelates were unable to do so, although they left no means untried.

Yet one at least who was born an Englishman can say that this Council was as free as our Parliament—a Council that had not even the right of verifying the titles of its own members! Kenrick concludes by expressing his persuasion that if the definition of Papal infallibility should go out in the name of this Council, it would rather increase dissension than promote peace, and would lead to a diminution of the rights of bishops and to the dishonour of the Pontiff himself.

The Liberal Catholics began, about this time, to notice the frequent expressions in Curialistic circles anticipating a war, in 1871, between France and Prussia.¹ The *Univers* now fixed a new date for the settlement of the great question—Ascension Day. All that could be said *pro* or *con*, had been said, according to this journal, in the memoranda written by the prelates; and so in the Council there would be only an exposition of the Decree prepared by the committee, after which the Fathers would at once proceed to the vote. No doubt the avoidance of further discussion was a matter of great account with those who were looking to the future. The effect of the new constitution, at least its immediate effect, would greatly depend upon the *éclat* with which it should be promulgated, and on the state of preparation to which the Catholic populations might be brought. If a tale of Friedrich, at the expense of Cardinal Capalti, be anything more than a joke, the question might have been settled by leaving it open. The Cardinal declared that he should be content with a definition of the infallibility of the Pope, whether it was infallibility with the bishops or without them.² The circulation of such a tale illustrates an impression prevailing, that even many of those in high places had not mastered the bearings of the question in dispute.

It was on the 10th of May that the proposed Decrees of Infallibility were distributed. ‘I shook all over my body,’ says Friedrich; ‘my senses seemed to forsake me as I read on.’ What was the amazement of the Professor to find not only all

¹ *Tagebuch*, p. 375.

² *Ibid.*, p. 391.

the mediæval pretensions taken up again, but the cool assertion made in notes, that all monuments of antiquity showed that the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff had been held as a truth divinely revealed. Another assertion which he noted, is that infallibility could never be disproved by history; but if any historical facts did appear to conflict with it, in so far as they did so they must be taken to be false. Again, the conclusions of any science, even those of ecclesiastical history, if opposed to the infallibility of the Pontiff, must be held to be *errora*. This is a very practical way of carrying out the principle announced by Cardinal Manning as to the dogma conquering history.

After reading this sort of matter, the indignant Professor cries, ‘Will our bishops dare to return home with such a verdict against all science, and against all sound reason? Does not this amount to saying—I believe it because it is absurd?’ The Archbishop of Bamberg gave Friedrich some light on the way in which history was to be kept right. He said that the Pope was irritated at Hefele’s pamphlet on the case of Honorius, and said, ‘There must be falsification of documents. The documents must be in the archives. Let them seek and they will find them; I am persuaded of it.’ It was publicly announced that the Pope had appointed two men to perform this duty. The Archbishop thought that the Curia would shrink from facing the judgment of the world. He placed his finger on his forehead, and said, ‘I cannot understand how a man in his senses can think of a personal infallible Pope.’ Archbishop Scherr having joined them, Deinlein added, ‘The world must rescue us. Had it not rescued us, we were already lost, and the Council over.’¹ To this Friedrich adds that Bishops Krementz and Namszanowski are already thinking of the coming excommunication; and that

¹ *Tagebuch*, p. 398. Friedrich in a note says that when he made this statement in Nuremberg the Vicar-General of Archbishop Deinlein published invectives against him, but could only say that such language does not come out of the mouth of the Archbishop—which Friedrich calls ridiculous absurdity.

Hefele had said gladly would he lay down the mitre and crozier, but what would become of his diocese?

Friedrich, wearied out in spirit, now spoke of going home. ‘ You must stay,’ said Bishop Namszanowski, ‘ for the historians must sit in judgment over this perfidious proceeding. It is impossible any longer to speak of a General Council. I only wonder that the German bishops have not already jumped out of their skin.’¹

One of Friedrich’s notes is to the effect that the Nuncio in Munich having reported that Archbishop Scherr in opposing infallibility commanded no sympathy among his people, the Pope sent for the Archbishop, and asked him why he took the side of the minority when he was isolated in his own diocese. The Archbishop asked Friedrich to tell Döllinger that even at this peculiar audience he had stood by him. Still he wished Döllinger not to do anything more; it would only increase the difficulties.²

The proposed Decrees on the Church were wonderfully changed. The celebrated twenty-one Canons were now omitted. The whole Draft was compressed into four chapters, with three Canons. Vitelleschi, as we have seen, cannot understand how governments, especially the government of France, should attach so much importance to the Canons, and so little to the dogma of infallibility. The latter, as he well says, virtually includes them all, and as many more besides as may spring from the sole and irresponsible will of an individual. John Lemoinne had hastily said that Infallibility affected France no more than the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception; but Prévost Paradol had, with better insight, shown that, on the contrary, it gave the Pope everything in theory, and left him in the position, step by step, first to assume and next to acquire everything in practice. The Immaculate Conception seriously affected France; not the doctrine, but the proceeding which set up a single master over the faith of France. That proceeding

¹ ‘ Noch nicht aus der Haut gefahren sei.’—*Tagebuch*.

² *Ibid.*, p. 400.

paved the way for Infallibility, which in its turn was to confirm for ever and render ordinary a despotic procedure which otherwise might have been treated as exceptional.

Friedrich, on reading one of the numberless prophecies as to the strengthening of authority which would result from the definition of infallibility, asks himself the question which so many have asked themselves in vain, How would the dogma operate to effect this? He replies, It would operate by sanctioning interference in the political life of nations; by condemnation of one form of government, and approbation of another; by excommunicating the contumacious; by interdicting them, and so on. The *Univers* of April 29th, after asking whether objectors meant to remain Catholics after the definition, and saying that if they answered No they were judged already, went on to remark, If they answer Yes they are preparing themselves for a kind of faith and obedience that is hardly reasonable; preparing to believe that what was black has become white through a Council invested with power to make true that which was false. Poor Montalembert did not live to read that taunt and menace both in one. Mrs. Oliphant mentions someone who said that the Count had expressed his intention to submit at last, for he must do so. That is one thing, and expressing an intention to believe is another. But those who know how such statements as that quoted by Mrs. Oliphant are made, would not give much for it if it came only from a female or a priest.

Bishop Martin related how Friedrich, as he walked on the Pincian the evening before leaving Rome, said, pointing to St. Peter's, 'If only the lightning fell from heaven and annihilated St. Peter's with all its glories!' 'No,' retorted Friedrich, 'I never said anything so silly. What I once did say on the Pincian was, referring to the superstition of the Pope, "Nothing can restrain the Pope from the definition, unless, indeed, at the critical moment, the well-known sunbeam fails, and some other natural phenomenon comes in its stead."'¹

¹ *Tagebuch*, p. 423.

To understand the line of thought by which calculating men connected the dogma with the prospect of universal dominion over the world, it is necessary to recall the primary elements of Church jurisdiction. As a kingdom appointed to govern the world, which is the ineradicable Papal conception, the Church rules through three tribunals—the internal, the external, and the supreme. Technically they are two, internal and external; the Pope being supreme in both. In the *internal tribunal* the Church cites; the cited are all the faithful. The person appearing is himself accuser and witness; the confessor is judge and jury. This tribunal, popularly called the Confessional, rules the conscience, the board, the bed, the purse, the family life, and the action of the individual in public life. In the *external tribunal* it is the ecclesiastical law which cites. Those cited are persons against whom any one either secretly or publicly complains. The witnesses may be either secret informer or open witness. The judge and jury are the ecclesiastical magistrate. This tribunal, popularly called the Ecclesiastical Court, rules all social questions whatever that have any moral interest or any colourable connection with religion. Finally, in the supreme tribunal the Curia cites. The parties cited are all against whom any appeal or any information has been laid. The witnesses are those whom the Curia chooses to call, or its informers. The Pope is judge and jury. This tribunal, popularly called the Pope, acting through some Roman congregation or court, settles all points as between confessor and penitent, as between priest and bishop, as between magistrates and parties to a process, as between rulers and subjects, as between State and State, and above all, as between any State with its ruler and the supreme tribunal.

These three tribunals between them give a complete control of the tangled web called the world, excepting only that ill-defined if not invisible selvage of it which consists of affairs not included within the domain of morals. And that web, with its cunning shots and all but invisible devises, is that ‘large and variegated web,’ which, when unfolding its program, the

Civiltá showed, would, after lustres had come and gone, appear as the fabric woven with the simple threads of its title, *Catholic Civilisation*; or, The Catholic Civil System.¹

Now, in the chaotic condition of recent times, President Moreno and Queen Isabella were the only two rulers that even seemed to be dutifully disposed to the Church in her tribunals; and poor Queen Isabella had already fallen.

In most countries, one who never entered the internal tribunal, might conduct a business, indeed he might even write a newspaper, or fill a professor's chair, ay, might make laws, or occupy a throne. Hence the crying need of a central authority so strong as to give to the external tribunal control over every bench, and to make the internal bear rule in every home, especially in every home wherein dwelt a ruler.

The proclamation of infallibility would be a complete restoration of the supreme tribunal, not indeed as to all the facts, but complete as to the ideas. This would bring about the restoration of facts in time. The supreme tribunal, working from above, and the internal tribunal, working from below, would gradually effect the reconstituting of the external tribunal. That is to say, the Pope and the Confessional would gradually procure first the establishment and then the complete supremacy of the ecclesiastical courts. In dealing with States, the supreme judge would have, step by step, to assume his lordship, and by assuming, would gradually acquire it. An infallible Pope would support every confessor, and every confessor would work for an infallible Pope. All politicians would be pressed to enact harmonious laws, to put State law under ecclesiastical law, and to give plenary liberty and due honour to the Church—liberty to rule in all her tribunals. They would be pressed to give to the Pope absolutely 'free communication with the faithful, so that no commands of his should be stayed or even obstructed by any law to the contrary, but that every enacting word that proceeded out his mouth should take, by divine

¹ See vol. i. of this work, p. 15.

right, precedence of the law of the land.' No conflict of conscience should ever arise, all knowing that the State submitted every one of its own statutes to the *divine* law. In addition to these natural processes, doubtless there were also marvels, if not miracles, to follow the tardy recognition by the Church of her head in all his glory. These arrayed the future in clothing of wrought gold to the eye of the Pope, of Don Margotti, and M. Veuillot, of one English prelate, with a few French and Spanish ones, who dreamed the dreams of Pio Nono. But it is plain that the great majority of the bishops calculated how the supreme judge, when once enthroned and acknowledged, would awe wayward kings and politicians; how, waiting for favourable political conjunctures, Nuncios would be able to move the bishops, and the bishops the clergy, and the clergy the people, till the patient power of the Church would bow all to her own laws. The hold already acquired upon schools, especially in France, was the most solid element in the entire calculation. The progress made within the last thirty years held out flattering hopes as to the future. The architects forgot that they had climbed up by a ladder which they had now kicked away. The voice to which concessions had been made was that of the Liberal Catholics pleading in the name of liberty, and they and their plea had now been unblushingly disowned.

CHAPTER V.

The Great Debate—Bishop Pie—The Virgin Mary on Infallibility—Cullen claims Ireland and MacHale—Kenrick's Reply, and his Account of the First Introduction of the Doctrine into Maynooth—MacHale speaks—Full Report of Darboy's Speech—The Pope gives Signs of Pleasure at Saldanha's Assault on the King of Portugal—New Date fixed for the Great Definition—Manning's Great Speech—Remarkable Reply of Kenrick—McEvilly ascribes Catholic Emancipation not to the Effect of Oaths, but to that of the Fear of Civil War—Kenrick's Retort—Clifford against Manning—Verot's Scene—Spalding's Attack on Kenrick—Kenrick's Refutation—Speeches of Valerga, Purcell, Conolly, and Maret—Sudden Close of the Debate.

ON the 13th of May began the great debate, if anything that took place in the Vatican Council may be called by that name. This conflict was to be the death of real parliamentary debating in all countries. It ranged over the whole Draft of the proposed Decrees. The scope of them is well indicated by M. Veuillot when he calls the Draft the *Schema* of the Pontiff. It treats only of primacy and infallibility. The first chapter treats of the institution of primacy in the person of Peter; the second treats of its descent through the Roman Pontiffs; the third, of its nature and scope; the fourth, of Papal infallibility.

Bishop Pie, of Poitiers, opened this famous field by a discourse much praised and much ridiculed. He argued for infallibility on the ground that Providence permitted St. Paul to be beheaded, and not St. Peter,¹ and on the further ground that Peter was crucified with the head downwards, to show that the body was to be supported by the head; but he who supports is infallible, and not he who is supported.² This truly Romish argument evoked, as Vitelleschi intimates, from the majority enthusiasm, and from the Opposition sarcastic smiles. We do not know whether any divine put before Bishop Pie the difficulty thrown in the way of his argument, by the fact that Providence must have permitted Peter to be beheaded after death, seeing that his head was with that of Paul in the Lateran, and only his trunk in St. Peter's. That, too, may be emblematic. We

¹ *Vitelleschi*, p. 158.

² *Quirinus*, p. 532.

No date or year
is /

cannot see any grave theological difficulty in believing that the trunk of Peter might have been with the Roman Pontiff, but we are quite sure that his head was with his beloved brother Paul.

On the next day, no less a person than the Cardinal Vicar ascended the tribune to plead for the glory of his chief. By a leap from centre to circumference, he was followed by the Archbishop of St. Francisco. Then came one from a spot on which had successively converged beams from the light of Egypt, Phœnicia, and Carthage, from that of Greece and Rome, a spot for which heavens thrice fair, with the waves of Scylla and Charybdis, the flame of Etna and its snows, had done all that could be done by beauty or sublimity, by poetry or by clime, to aid the offices of civilisation. The Archbishop of Messina relieved the gravity of the debate by relating how Peter had preached in Sicily; but when he told the people that he was infallible they doubted. They, however, sent an embassy to the Virgin Mary, to ask if she had heard of the infallibility of Peter. The Virgin replied that she certainly remembered being present when her Son conferred this prerogative upon him.¹ This speech has caused some correspondence in the Italian papers, especially touching the letter of the Virgin, which is still in existence, and has an annual feast all to itself. Somehow we are not ourselves clear as to the history of the embassy and of the letter. It is said that the letter was let down from heaven by the Virgin; but if that be so, where did the ambassadors go to with their message? But as the events took place before the age of reconstruction, we shall not digress further.

The discussion proceeded from day to day, a long and increasing list of names promising endless speeches. Three Cardinals spoke on the 18th of May—Schwarzenberg, Rauscher, and Donnet. Vitelleschi reports Schwarzenberg as having said (p. 159), ‘It is said that you really believe in this dogma; but,

¹ *Quirinus*, p. 533.

if that be true, you cannot insist that I and my companions ought to acknowledge what seems to us absurd; and if you do insist, be sure that schisms will arise, and abjurations will follow within the Church of Rome.' On the 19th of May the pulpit was ascended by Cardinal Cullen, carrying with him the confidence of power in Ireland, and of favour with the Curia. Coming of 'a right noble Irish family,' as the official history says,¹ and trained after the heart of the Curia, he had well justified their expectations in carrying out the centralising system, to which he owed his mitre. He addressed himself particularly to the task of refuting Hefele's pamphlet on the heresy of Pope Honorius, contending that it could not be reconciled with what that prelate had written in his history of Councils.² But he also attacked Kenrick for his memorandum already spoken of. He charged the latter with impairing the argument for the primacy of the Pope, by asserting that the other apostles were also called foundations as well as Peter. Furthermore, Kenrick had asserted that the words 'lambs' and 'sheep' in the Vulgate (John xxi. 16, 17) both stood for one and the same Greek word, and hence he had contended that the stock Curialistic argument, that the bishops, 'sheep,' are placed under the Pope as well as the people, 'lambs,' had actually not even the show of a foundation in the passage. This was a sore point, for what would the Papal system have done before infallibility was proclaimed without this passage? It was as important as 'Obey God rather than man,' or as 'Teach all nations.' The distinction between sheep and lambs clearly proved to those whom the Curia calls theologians, that the Pope was the ruler of the 'sheep,' the full-grown bishops, as well as of the 'lambs,' the immature priesthood and laity. Now, however, since infallibility has been proclaimed, it probably will not be necessary to quote Scripture to the bishops to prove that, whether dispersed or gathered in a flock, they are but sheep to the Pope. *It is not true*, asserted Cullen, that the two Latin words in those verses represent one

¹ *Frond*, vol. ii.

² *Documenta ad Illustrandum*, ii., 209.

and the same Greek word in the original. He quoted Oriental versions. *It is not true*, he repeated, with emphasis.

As to the word 'faith,' a word which Rome has, like so many others, killed, disembowelled, and embalmed, Kenrick had asserted that our Lord never employed it as meaning a *body of doctrine*, and that He employed it not more than once or twice as meaning the act by which we believe in God as revealing Himself; but that He generally employed it as meaning trust or confidence. This, Kenrick had asserted, was the sense of the word in the passage on which the attempt was made to build the infallibility of all dogmas found in the Decrees of the Roman Pontiff. The words are, 'I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not.' That is, our Lord had prayed that the trust and confidence of Peter should not entirely fail; and Rome argued that He thereby promised that everything in the Decrees of the Roman Pontiffs, affecting doctrine or morals, should be for evermore free from error. Kenrick's exposition of what our Lord really did say made this argument appear not only futile but unfair. Cullen met him by declaring that his views savoured of the Calvinian heresy. The Cardinal proceeded to deny that bishops, as successors of the apostles, possessed that universal jurisdiction in the Church which the apostles themselves had received from Christ. He quoted a work of a deceased brother of Kenrick, formerly Archbishop of Baltimore, on the Primacy of the Apostolic See. Cullen, moreover, claimed Ireland and the Irish for infallibility in the teeth of oaths, catechisms, records, and living memories. In doing so, he was indiscreet enough to name, as on his side, MacHale, the lion of St. Jarlath, who had sat silent under the weight of his nearly four-score years.

Kenrick, feeling that Cullen had said things which touched his honour,¹ prayed for leave to reply, either at once or at the end of the sitting. This was refused: Archbishops must wait till all the Cardinals who chose to speak had spoken, and Kenrick must wait till all archbishops senior to himself had

¹ 'Meum honorem graciter lasserunt.'—*Documenta ad Illustrandum*, i., 189.

been heard. He prepared a speech, but the debate was cut short before he had the opportunity of delivering it. Thereupon he resorted to the expedient of printing. To this document we are indebted for some of our most trustworthy information as to the real position taken up by different speakers.¹

Kenrick said that Cullen had, in very severe language, charged him with impairing the argument for the primacy of the Pontiff, by alleging that the other apostles were called foundations as well as Peter. That, however, was not his language, but must be laid at the door of the 'divine' Paul and John. Kenrick admitted primacy, but denied infallibility. He also denied that Christ had made the stability of the Church dependent on Peter as the foundation. He had provided for her stability otherwise, by saying, 'Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.' Cullen had further said, and that repeatedly and with much energy of expression, 'It is false,' because Kenrick asserted that one and the same Greek word was translated both 'sheep' and 'lambs' in the sixteenth and seventeenth verses of John^{xxi}. But, in so doing, replied Kenrick, the Cardinal had betrayed a little infirmity.² The fact remained, that in those two verses the Vulgate did translate one and the same Greek word by two Latin ones. Moreover, in the reading adopted by Tischendorf, there was no word in any of the three utterances of our Lord which properly represented the word 'sheep'; and the reading adopted by Tischendorf was confirmed by that which they might see inscribed on the arch of the Vatican Church, over the throne of the Pontiff.³ In answer to the assertion of the Cardinal, that his exposition of the meaning of the word 'faith' savoured of the Calvinian heresy, Kenrick said that perhaps his Eminence had not weighed the full significance of such language. He

¹ *Documenta ad Illustrandum*, pp. 187-224.

² *Aliquid humani passum esse.*

³ He showed that Tischendorf read *τροπάρια* in both cases, and that other editors had read *τρόπαρα* in both. Of course, in the fifteenth verse, the word 'lambs'—*ἀρνία*—is the proper translation.

showed that out of twenty-nine places in the Gospels where the word occurred, in all but two it clearly meant confidence, or else the faith that works miracles; and that in only two could it be taken for the theological virtue of believing in God's revelation of Himself. He was still fully persuaded that its real meaning, in the words addressed by our Lord to Peter, was that of trust or confidence.

But Kenrick contended that Cullen had, by his own method of reasoning, taken away all the force usually ascribed by theologians to the words, 'Thou art Peter.' He had said that the privileges given to the other apostles by our Lord did not descend to their successors. If that was the case with the other apostles, surely it would be also the case with Peter. Kenrick, however, firmly contended that apostolic authority did not emanate from the Pontiff, but was given to the bishops by Christ Himself, and that the restriction of it to certain localities was merely by appointment of the Church.

After showing that the interpretation of the words 'Upon this rock,' which was supported by the greatest number of the Fathers, was that which regards the faith declared in the Confession of Peter as the foundation on which the Church was to be built, he pointed out that the word 'foundation' has two clearly distinguished and well-defined meanings. First, the natural foundation, or that to which a wise builder clears his way before laying a stone—the living rock. Secondly, the architectural foundation, namely, the first course of stones laid on this rock. He contended that attention to this simple fact made the language of both classes of passages perfectly clear; those in which our Lord alone is called the Foundation, and those in which the apostles are so called. At the same time it cut away all the ground on which an argument in favour of the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff is built, because he is the foundation of the Church. Incidentally, he cuts deep both into the creed of Pius IV. and into the conduct of Pius IX. He says, We are bound not to interpret Holy Scripture in oppo-

sition to the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and it may be doubted if such unanimous consent ever took place (p. 195). But to speak so was to laugh at the creed of Pius IV., and at Kenrick's own oath, and at that of every man sitting there with his soul fettered by that intricate chain. His oath did not merely bind him, as he fancied, not to interpret in opposition to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. That, indeed, was what the Council of Trent decreed, but, as we showed in our note on Dr. Newman, the Pope reformed the irreformable. Kenrick and all of them stood there bound not to interpret 'otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.' Kenrick correctly intimated that there was no unanimous consent. Therefore he and they alike had been breaking their oath, day by day, all the time of their priesthood.

As to the conduct of Pius IX., his stroke was severe. He wanted to rebuke Cardoni, Perrone, and the other favourite Court theologians, for a signal example of an interpretation of a text of Scripture less ingenuous than was meet. Speaking of the work in which Cardoni, Archbishop of Edessa, gave the unfair interpretation, 'This pamphlet,' he says, 'was commended by eleven distinguished theologians, with Peronne at their head, to the Pontiff, by whose permission, doubtless, it was exempted from the rule which forbade the bishops to communicate their views to one another in print, unless, indeed, they chose to go and print elsewhere than in Rome' (p. 196). Thus is exhibited the binding and the loosing. Pius IX. bound all his brother bishops not to print in the Holy City, and kept all bound who might print what was not proper; but archbishops who were happy enough to have Sees in Edessa, and yet to lead the life of the Curia, were loosed in order to write down the unhappy men who had to face mankind.

As to the testimony of the Church with regard to the proposed dogma, Kenrick states it thus:—

'The dogma is not contained in the creeds; it is not given in the Catechisms as an article of faith; it is not found as such in any monu-

ment of public worship. Therefore the Church has not heretofore taught it as being of the faith ; and had it been a doctrine of faith, she ought to have taught it, and to have handed it down.

' Not only has the Church not taught it in any public standard, but she has permitted it to be impugned, and not in one place alone, but in almost all the world, Italy excepted, and that throughout a great length of time. . . . To speak of the nations which use the English tongue, in no one standard or catechetical book of theirs is this opinion enumerated among the verities that are of faith. In the United States, as in Ireland, all books of piety and doctrine were drawn from England till the opening of this century, and later. In the greater part of those books, the opposite opinion is contained. In none is this opinion found as being of faith' (p. 212).

He shows that recently a few books had appeared as if to prepare the people for the new dogma. Alluding evidently to the work of the Jesuit Weninger, which the Pope had praised, he calls the author a zealous but unlearned man, and says his work was more calculated to excite ridicule than anger, and that when the author had applied to himself for some commendation, he had incautiously promised him the charity of silence.

As to the use made by Cullen of his brother's work, he said he had felt as if the dead had been commended in order to rebuke the living. As to the faith of the Irish, he remarked that a smile had been raised when Verot, of Augustine, in Florida, said that the Irish believed even their priests to be infallible. But it was true, for believing the Church to be infallible, and the priest to be in harmony with the Church, they believed him to be infallible, and with the difference of his more exalted rank, it was precisely in the same sense that they believed the Pope to be infallible. But as to their understanding the question now agitated, or being able to form an opinion concerning it, that was too ridiculous to need confutation (p. 216). He even doubted if a meeting in Cork, over which the bishop of the see was said to have presided, had understood the question ; and indeed it was apparent, from what had passed in that Hall, that there were bishops there who were not clear as to what Papal infallibility meant.

Turning from the populace of Ireland to the prelates and

doctors, he was ready to grant that now, influenced by some distinguished names, the preponderating opinion might be in favour of Papal infallibility; on that point, however, he knew nothing more than what he had been able to learn since coming to Rome. But in the beginning it was not so. His proof of this was the almost universal applause with which the writings of Dr. Doyle had been received, and those of the Rev. Arthur O'Leary. Further, he cited answers given to a committee of the British Parliament in 1825 by the Archbishops of Dublin and Tuam, Murray and O'Kelly, as well as by Bishop Doyle. These answers he printed with his speech, both in the original English and in a Latin translation. He further cited a manifesto of all the Irish bishops in the year 1815, addressed directly to the Holy See, which clearly shows that they did not hold the views embodied in the proposed Decrees. He prints this document also.

Next, passing from the Irish prelates to the priests, Kenrick confidently affirms that they in former times did not differ from the prelates. Long after the establishment of Maynooth College, the professors, he declares, came from France, and their treatises were in the hands of the pupils long subsequently to their own death. He calls the Archbishop of Cashel as a witness, while he relates how the change of teaching was first introduced in that college. They were there at the time as fellow-students. Forty years ago, says Kenrick, John O'Hanlon was Tutor in Theology, as he is now Moderator of the higher theological sciences in the college. The text-book, *De Ecclesia* at that time was *Delahogue*. It contained nothing, says Kenrick, about Papal infallibility, except a proposition in these or similar words, 'It is not of faith that the Pope is infallible' (p. 218).

In the year 1831, O'Hanlon gave his pupils, as a theme, the following proposition: 'The Pope, speaking *ex cathedrā*, is infallible.' O'Hanlon did not indicate any opinion of his own, and did not urge the pupils in discussing the thesis to take either one side or the other, but left them to argue for the

negative or affirmative at their discretion. Kenrick was one of those who took the affirmative; but he adds, *Language so new, and hitherto unheard of*, did not please all the professors. One of them, who subsequently became President of the college, strongly expressed his dissatisfaction to my fellow-student, now the Bishop of Clonfert, from whom I had the statement. Kenrick then makes a confident appeal to MacHale, to whom Cullen had made a presumptuous one:—

‘There sits here a venerable man, who many years ere I entered that college expounded theology within its walls, who is by good right looked upon as the Nestor of the Irish bishops, for he has lived with almost three generations of men; one who with eminent theological learning combined a glory of classic lore, and also had intimate acquaintance with the prelates whom I have cited, and with other men of learning whose bright and venerable names are inscribed on the hearts of the Irish, and among their glories. . . . He, with rare moderation, had not given expression to his views on the matter now under discussion. So that his Eminence of Dublin did not hesitate to speak for him, and to claim him as being upon his own side. Those who feel with me, and who had known him, desiring to see him contending by our side, were grieved to behold him sitting apart like another Achilles. I was filled, therefore, with an unlooked-for joy when I heard him say that in judgments on matters of faith the head ought to be conjoined with the body; not, as his Grace of Westminster would have it, that the head of itself, communicating infallibility to itself, should draw the body along with it, but that head and body, conjointly bearing witness to the faith delivered to the saints, should declare it with one mind. As the Archbishop of Tuam descended from this pulpit, I congratulated him in these words: “You have vindicated Ireland—*Vindicasti Hiberniam.*” If witnesses of the faith of the Irish are to be, as they ought to be, weighed and not counted, the Archbishop of Tuam, at least in the capacity of a witness, will easily surpass the other Irish bishops, not even excepting his Eminence of Dublin’ (p. 218).

The above important statement of Archbishop Kenrick shows that the new dogma, according to which the Bull *Unam Sanctam* becomes of divine authority in doctrine, was not kept out of Maynooth very long after the oaths and denials of preceding years had served their purpose. It was introduced as early as 1831.

The day following the speech of Cardinal Cullen—for our

light on which we are indebted to Kenrick's important contribution—the Primate of Hungary appeared in the pulpit. His position as a member of the Committee on Faith, his doubtful bearing, and, above all, rumours of a hat, had made an impression that he had gone over to the side of the Infallibilists. On the contrary, he now spoke with decision and force against them. It was after the courage of the minority had been for a moment revived by this speech, that one ascended the desk, who to most present was only a feeble old man, but to Irish prelates, and to some of Irish origin, he represented one who, in the thundering days of the Liberator, was spoken of, at every wake and 'patron,' as a mighty son of hail and storm. It was he to whom Cullen had appealed, on the previous day, as a witness to the ancient faith of the Irish in Papal infallibility. But Kenrick has already shown us that John MacHale stood as a hoary monument of departed principles; and it was when he came down that Kenrick cried, 'Thou hast vindicated Ireland.' Leahy, Archbishop of Cashel, was the next called up; but after the speech of MacHale he declined to speak.¹

The archbishops were still on the roll, so the same day the Archbishop of Paris had his turn. Here again we get an indisputable glimpse into the arcana. Like Kenrick's speech, that of Darboy is printed; but unlike Kenrick's, it was actually delivered.² We shall, therefore, give the principal portions of it, wishing that we were in a position to do so with a speech from the other side:—

'Most eminent, most reverend Fathers,—I approach the consideration of the First Dogmatic Constitution, *De Ecclesia*, submitted to your examination,—a task which would be ungrateful did not love of the truth and affection and reverence towards the brethren render it easy and not unwelcome. I will treat the proposed Decree with a mind, as I trust, free from all party spirit, wishing not to offend any one, and fervently hoping that you will ingenuously receive what I am about to say, as I shall ingenuously present it.'

¹ *Acta Sanctae Sedis.* As to MacHale, Kenrick omits what *Fronde* states, that he was of a 'very ancient' family.

² *Documenta*, ii., pp. 415-424.

'It seems to me that there are three things to be looked at: first, the origin of this proposed Decree; secondly, its scope and nature; thirdly, its practical consequences.

'As to the origin of this proposed Decree, and its introduction at the present time into the Council, I shall state a few self-evident propositions without discussing them, or rather shall recall to mind a few facts, from which the reverend Fathers will be able to judge whether the whole matter has been conducted according to order, and whether the dignity of an assembly so venerable has been sufficiently consulted:—

'1. It is certain that the pivot on which our proposed Decree altogether turns is the fourth chapter—that which treats of the infallibility of the Pontiff.

'2. It is certain that this question of infallibility has been the principal object of the Vatican Council—so much so indeed that it has been indiscreetly said by many that, in a certain sense, it was the sole object of it.

'3. It is certain that this principal question of infallibility was not intimated in the Bull of Convocation, nor in the documents relating to the convocation of the Council.

'4. It is certain that this question has been urged forward from without, that is, by writers lay and clerical, in a way contrary to ecclesiastical and traditional methods, adopted against all rules of subordination and decorum; an agitation got up by means of demagogues, so to speak, in order that the consciences of the bishops sitting here might be placed under pressure, and that they might be subjected to fear that, if they resisted they should not be able to return to their dioceses and govern them without difficulty.

'5. It is certain that thus the matter has been brought to such a pass that the Vatican Fathers, albeit piously and generously following their own conscience, have been said, nevertheless, to have conceded more than was meet to these violent manifestations, and to factitious opinions, when they petitioned for the introduction of the question of infallibility; and because of this tumult, which has been raised at the doors of the Council Hall, the liberty and the dignity of us all have evidently been somewhat lowered. This is unbecoming, and opens the way to grave inconvenience; indeed, it is not to be tolerated without injury and opprobrium to this venerable assembly, which ought to act from its own impulse, and ought to be not only free, but manifestly free.

'6. It is certain that the question, as this day proposed, comes on out of the natural and logical order; and thus occasions some prejudice which will damage the cause itself.

'7. It is certain that the premature introduction of the question, especially with the present inversion of proper order, is of little service to the Holy See—nay, is detrimental to its honour; for since, according to the Rules of Procedure, contained in *Multiplices Inter*, petitions are remitted to a Special Congregation, which reports upon them to the Pontiff, and

since the Pontiff can freely accept or reject the conclusions of that Congregation, it follows that the promoters of the petition for introducing the question of infallibility, and for placing it first in order, publicly led the Holy Father into the position of enacting and deciding in his own case, and for his personal privilege; in doing which—certainly without intention on their part—they have ill consulted his high dignity, if they may not be said to have even detracted from it.

' If these seven positions be true—and they seem to be most true—we cannot approach and determine this question of infallibility, raised under such circumstances, and introduced in such a manner, without preparing the way for the cavile of the impious, and for objections lowering to the moral authority of this Council. This is the more to be guarded against, because already writings and documents are in circulation which aim at shaking its strength and title; so that, far from calming the minds of the people, and securing the things which make for peace, it would seem, on the contrary, to be sowing the seeds of new disputations and discords among Christians.

' If, therefore, I may give a practical conclusion to this portion of my speech, I would say: (1) They did well who held this question to be inopportune; (2) They will do well who shall judge it opportune to abstain from a definition.

' Now, as to the second portion of my speech,—the scope and nature of this proposed Decree,—I shall indicate a few points, but not develop them.

' 1. The object of the proposed Decree is not to frame a doctrine on infallibility, for all know and with Catholic faith believe in the infallibility of the Church, which has held that tenet for nearly twenty centuries. Its object is to define, and to propound as an article of faith, that the chief Pontiff is infallible by himself alone, and that indeed this privilege of inerrancy extends as widely as the infallibility of the Church itself. It is to be noted that the proposed Decree does not treat of the former kind of infallibility, admitted by all, according to which the invincible and irrefragable force of Decrees or dogmatic decisions commanding the faith of all the faithful, as of all pastors, lies solely in the common consent of the bishops conjoined with the Pontiff. But this proposed Decree treats of the separate and absolute personal infallibility of the Pontiff, though it is not openly called so.

' 2. The proposed Decree does not treat of personal infallibility as a mere opinion, or as recommending a point of doctrine, but as declaring a dogma of the faith. Heretofore, indeed, there was some discussion as to the opportuneness and expediency of introducing this question in the present Council; but that discussion was closed from the time that the chief Pontiff decreed that the subject could no longer be passed over in silence. But now the other part of the question has come to be discussed, namely, whether or not the personal infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff

can opportunely and expediently now be declared an article of the faith, and ought to be so declared? This is precisely the matter and object of the present discussion.

3. Further, in order that the object may be rightly carried through, and may have a successful issue, these three things are necessary: (1) A formula, or definition of the doctrine; (2) Proofs of it, both solid and excluding all doubt; (3) Its acceptance by all with moral unanimity.

The first necessity:—It is necessary to compose a formula or definition of the doctrine. That this is most difficult is apparent from the case of those who first drafted the proposed Decree, as well as of those who revised it. Terms are used which are vague, and fitted to give rise to endless discussion. What is meant by exercising the office of supreme teacher of all Christians? What are the complete external conditions which mark the exercise of this office? When will it be known that the Holy Pontiff has spoken in such a character? The promoters of the proposed Decree say that this will be obvious, as for instance the meaning of the term "ecumenical" is obvious; but they inflict a wound on themselves. For a Council is not held to be ecumenical by the faithful dispersed throughout the world, unless it is received as such by them perhaps with what amounts to moral unanimity. Hence if the nature, character, and force of Decrees emanating from the Pontiff are to be declared and known by the same method, the promoters of the Decree have accomplished nothing, since the ultimate reason for admitting infallibility will be the universal consent of the bishops. Do they or do they not regard the consent of the bishops as unnecessary in laying down definitions of the faith? If they do regard it as unnecessary, they do a thing that is new, unheard of, and intolerable. If they do not regard it as unnecessary, they say a thing that is old, and received by all, and draw up their battle array against a foe that is not in the field. In either case they neither can nor ought to be silent as to the necessity or inutility of the concurrence of the bishops. Silence on their part in such a matter, and in such circumstances, would drive the faithful to new doubts, and would prepare the way for new difficulties. They do not define the matters to which infallibility extends, otherwise than by saying that it extends to those to which the infallibility of the Church extends; but such an indication is altogether insufficient till the holy Council shall have defined the matters to which the infallibility of the Church does extend. Hence, again appears the logical vice from which this proposed Decree on the primacy suffers through being brought forward before the Decree on the Church in general. Moreover, when dealing with the Church, we know that her infallibility is always exercised within the limits of matters to which it extends, both because we are advised that it is so by the common consent of the bishops, and also because the Church is holy and cannot sin. But, on the contrary, when dealing with the Holy Pontiff, the promoters of the proposed Decree, whatever they may say, exclude on the

one hand the consent of the bishops, and on the other hand they have not yet attempted to prove that every Pontiff is holy and impeccable. So far for what relates to the discovery of a formula.

'The second necessity':—A formula of definition having been found, it is necessary to prove it by solid arguments, excluding all doubt. Let it then be proved :—(1) That this doctrine of personal infallibility is contained in Holy Scripture interpreted always in one sense, as well as in the tradition of all ages ;—(2) That it has always been received by consent of the Fathers, the doctors, the bishops, and theologians; not only by some of them, but by so many as amounts to a moral whole ;—(3) That it perfectly accords with all the Decrees and authoritative acts of Ecumenical Councils, or even with the Decrees passed in the fourth and fifth sessions of the Council of Constance. Even were the ecumenicity of those sessions to be denied—which I do not admit—they still show what was the common opinion of theologians and bishops ;—(4) That this doctrine is not gravely impugned by historical facts, and that other acts of the Holy Pontiffs are not in conflict with it ;—(5) And, finally, that this is one of those truths which can be defined by General Councils in union with the Pontiff, as being demonstrably one of those which had been received by all, everywhere, and always as revealed truth.

'The proposed Decree does not supply such arguments, and the Fathers, as you well know, have not had time to weigh it; therefore we ought to refrain from defining it. In a matter of this kind, which involves the laying of an irrevocable burden on the conscience of the faithful, there is grave peril if you act prematurely, without absolute certainty. But there is no risk to be run in deciding it to be a matter that requires to be more fully discussed, and then afterwards determining it with all safety of conscience.'

'The third necessity':—It is necessary that this doctrine of personal and independent infallibility, clearly stated, as we have said, and solidly proved, should be received by the Fathers with moral unanimity; else it is to be feared that this declaration of doctrine will seem to many to be a pontifical Constitution indeed, but not a Decree of a Council. To impose a truth upon all Christians, to be held as an article of faith, is a duty and a right so grave that a bishop must not exercise it without great circumspection.

"Hence, as you well know, the Tridentine Fathers, whatever sophists may say to the contrary, did not arrive at their decisions in matters of dogma by majority, but with moral unanimity.

'As to the practical consequences of the proposed Decree, I would particularly note two points; for this personal infallibility is not required and proposed as a matter of faith, except in order that unity in the Church may become closer and that the central authority may be stronger, and that thus a remedy may be more effectually applied to every evil. As to unity and central authority, they ought to exist and to be main-

tained, not as we may fancy them, or as our reason may persuade us, but just as our Lord Jesus Christ instituted them, and as our Fathers hitherto have held them. For it is not for us to constitute the Church arbitrarily, and to change the conditions of a divine work. The necessary unity, that namely of faith and communion under the paternal rule of a central authority, exists and always has existed among Catholics; and that unity of doctrine and communion, and that central authority of the Holy Pontiffs, which flourished without a dogmatic definition of infallibility, abides unimpaired.

'Let it not be said that this unity would become stricter after the central authority had been rendered stronger, for the consequence does not follow. It is not enough to be one, but we must also have that kind and that degree of unity which are required by the nature and character of the case, and by the law and necessity of life. Nay, it may be that a thing shall wretchedly perish, precisely for the reason that it has been reduced to an overstrained unity; for in that condition its internal forces cannot exercise themselves and discharge their vital functions, being broken and crushed by the bond of an overstrained and exaggerated unity. So in respect of moral force, the unity of men, when acting freely and with vigour under law, is looser yet more comely than is the unity of bondsmen sluggishly existing under tyranny.'

'Therefore, let us not separate the bishops from the Holy Pontiff, nor the Pontiff from the bishops. Let us faithfully hold the ancient rule of faith and the things ordained of the Fathers, and that all the more because the proposed definition will give rise to many and serious inconveniences.'

'It can scarcely be doubted that this remedy will be powerless for healing the evils of the day; and indeed it is to be feared that to very many it will be injurious. The matter must be looked at not merely in a theological point of view, but also in its aspects towards civil society; for surely we do not sit here as so many head-sacristans, or superiors of little Congregations, but as men received into a share of his solicitude by the chief Pontiff, who holds the care of the entire Church. Let us, therefore, prudently survey the condition of the world.'

'Will personal and independent infallibility raise again from the grave the extinct Churches on the African shores? or will it awake out of sleep that East which once bloomed with so many talents and virtues? Will it be easier for our brethren, the Vicars Apostolic, to bring back Pagans, Mohammedans, and Schismatics, to the Catholic faith, if they teach them that the Pope is infallible by himself? Will the definition encourage and animate Protestants, and other heretics, to draw near to the Roman Church, laying aside all their prejudices and animosities? So far for distant regions.'

'But what of Europe? I say it with grief—the Church is banished from everything. She is banished from those Congresses in which peace

and war between nations is determined, and in which, in former times, the authority of the Holy See prevailed ; whereas now decisions affecting that See itself are taken, and it may not give its opinion. The Church is banished from the legislative bodies in several kingdoms of the Church ; and if here and there some prelates or priests are found in them, it seems a wonder. She is banished from the schools where grave errors stalk with impunity ; from the laws which profess to be secular in their nature, and hence are irreligious ; from the family where civil marriage taints morals. Almost all those who are at the head of human affairs in Europe either shun us or keep us at a distance.

' Again, in these straits of the Church, what remedy is offered to the world in travail ? The promoters of the proposed Decree wish us to lay a new and, therefore, heavy and odious load on those who are already shaking from their indocile shoulders burdens imposed of old time and rendered venerable by usage of our Fathers. They almost crush all who are of weak faith, with a new and inopportune dogma, a dogma never heretofore defined, and to some extent damaged by wounds received in this discussion, and one to be pronounced by a Council, of which many assert and declare that its liberty is less evident than it should have been. It is hoped by this definition of a personal and separate infallibility to be able to heal everything, to strengthen faith in all, and to improve morals. But in vain is it hoped. The world is sick or dying, not for want of knowing the truth, or the teachers of it, but because it shuns the truth and will not submit to it. If, therefore, the world rejects the truth, when it is preached by the whole body of the Teaching Church—that is, by eight hundred bishops scattered all over the world and infallible in connection with the Holy Pontiff—how much more will it reject that truth when it is preached by one Infallible Teacher, and that teacher recently declared to be such ! But again : in order that authority may prevail and effectually operate, it is not enough that it be affirmed ; it must also be accepted. It does not suffice, therefore, to declare the Pope infallible, personally and separately from the bishops, but he must be received as such by all, if he is not to exercise his office in vain. For instance, what avails an anathema when the authority of him who excommunicates is disregarded ? And, most reverend Fathers, pray permit one instance more. The Syllabus went all through Europe, and what evil has it healed, even in those places where it was received as an infallible oracle ? At that time two kingdoms remained wherein religion still flourished, ascendant not only in fact, but also by law ; I mean Austria and Spain. Yet in those two kingdoms this Catholic order has fallen to the ground, although commended by infallible authority,—ay, perhaps, at least in Austria, exactly for the reason that it was commended by it.

' Let us, therefore, look at matters as they stand. The separate and independent infallibility of the most Holy Pontiff, so far from removing

the objections and prejudices which turn many away from the faith, is increasing and aggravating them. Very many even of those who are not hostile to the Catholic religion are now meditating what they call separation of the Church from civil society. Not a few of those who lead public affairs lean in this direction, and they will gladly seize the opportunity, given by the proposed definition, to carry this separation into effect. Besides, what will be done in France will soon be imitated more or less throughout Europe, certainly not without serious loss to the Church and the clergy. Whether they mean it or not, the promoters of the proposed Decree are, by their definition, instituting a new order of things full of risks, and that all the more if they do not more exactly determine the matters to which personal infallibility extends; and [if they do not determine] whether it will be possible to assert that the Pope, when defining in matters pertaining to morals, does by that act pronounce as to the civil and political conduct of kings and nations, and as to the laws and rights which are now reputed to belong to the public authority. No one skilled in politics can fail to see what seeds of contention our proposed Decree contains, and to what perils the temporal power of the Holy See itself is exposed.

'But to enter into this fully would be tedious, perhaps indiscreet; for certainly I could not adduce here all the arguments which come to my hand, without touching upon several things which prudence counsels me to avoid. I have relieved my conscience as far as possible. Accept my words for the worth which your judgment may award to them. I know, indeed, that disadvantages are attached to any course, and that we are not always to abstain from acting because disasters may follow; but I do not ask the venerable Fathers to fall suddenly into my views, but rather ask that they may maturely consider and balance the arguments in favour of the one view and the other. I also know that we are not to make puerile concessions to public opinion, but no more are we pertinaciously to thwart it. It is wiser and more adroit to adjust many things with it, and in any case to take it into account. And, finally, I know that the Church does not need the temporal arm, but neither does she repel the assent and aid of civil society; and, as I take it, she did not, in the days of Constantine, weakly sigh for a renewal of the days of Nero.'

Quirinus says that a suppressed murmur running through the ranks of the majority as Darboy spoke, seemed to herald coming storms (p. 553).

On the 23rd of May, Ketteler is said to have made a real impression—indeed, Vitelleschi intimates that he made converts (p. 162)—by a strong representation of the effect of the proposed Decrees on what remained of episcopal jurisdiction.

On the same day Ginoulhiac, who had been Bishop of Grenoble, but had just been made Archbishop of Lyons, did what was looked upon as a deed of high courage by opposing the definition.

At the same time an incident occurred which caused all Rome to talk of the Pope's personal energy in pushing his policy, and to whisper as to the mysterious connection of political movements in different countries with the silent will of Rome. Though Portugal no longer occupied, in the eye of the world, the place she once held, her importance to the Papacy was still great. News arrived that the Duke of Saldanha had, by a military *pronunciamento*, assailed the King in his palace, and compelled him to accept a new Ministry, with himself for its head. He was of the clerical party, and immediately found a pretext for quarrelling with the minister representing Italy. The tidings of these events no sooner reached Rome than the Pope visited the national church of the Portuguese in the city. His organ, the *Osservatore Romano*, in announcing the fact, said that his Holiness had wished to inspect the restoration of the Church made by the Duke of Saldanha when ambassador in Rome. The impression made was that the Pope wished, before all the bishops and princes, to give the Duke the only mark of approbation in his power. Vitelleschi observes that a *pronunciamento* is the worst form of revolution, because it disturbs the highest expression of order and violates the faith which holds soldiers to their flag (p. 165). What, however, is revolution when directed against the supernatural order, is restoration and reconstruction when it favours the sacred cause.

The time for the definition was now rather peremptorily fixed by the authoritative organs. The day of Mary, the day of Joseph, the Epiphany, and the Ascension, and other very good days, had all in turn failed; but it was to be on St. Peter's Day, and was not that the fittest day of all?

The Archbishop of Westminster, in the name of the com-
m...ing

mittee, spoke, on May 25th, for nearly two hours. Indeed, morning by morning the committee availed itself of the right of reply granted to its members exclusively, by setting up one of them to refute the objections advanced in the previous sitting. Kenrick says that he knew not which to admire most—Manning's diction, his delivery, his power of command and frankness, or his ardour in urging and almost commanding the new definition.¹

'I thought,' says Kenrick, 'of what used to be said of Englishmen living in Ireland, that they were more Irish than the Irish themselves. The Archbishop is certainly more Catholic than all the Catholics I have known hitherto. He himself feels no doubt as to pontifical infallibility, personal, separate, and absolute; and he will not permit others to feel any. He asserts that the doctrine is of faith, and as such he hardly asks the Council to define it, but rather predicts that it will do so—perhaps after the manner of those prophets who strive to bring events to pass by foretelling them. So far as concerns myself—as one whom sixty years that have passed over me since I began to learn the rudiments of the faith, have perhaps left as well instructed on the point in question as one who joined the Church about twenty years ago—I dare to assert that the opinion, as it is found in the proposed Decree, is not a doctrine of faith, and that it cannot become such by any definition whatsoever, even that of a Council. We are custodians of the deposit of faith, not lords of it. We are teachers indeed of the faithful committed to our care, in so far as we are witnesses.'

Manning resented, *graviter illud tulit*, the attempt which had been made to raise a case of conscience in the mind of the bishops by asserting that any bishop would incur the guilt of a mortal sin who gave a vote in favour of infallibility without having duly investigated the question for himself; because his act would contribute to impose a new yoke on the faithful. This Manning held to be injurious to the dignity and the honour of the bishops; as if, says Kenrick, he denied that bishops could sin, or denied that they would be guilty of mortal sin if through negligence or idleness they failed rightly to inform their judgments.

Manning contended that infallibility was a supernatural grace—*charisma*—and, therefore, that it properly attached to a

¹ *Documenta*, i., 209.

person. He would not hear of conditions being connected with the exercise of infallibility. He asserted that he who had bestowed this supernatural grace would also give the means for its due exercise.¹ Moreover, he took the ground that the Council had already, in the conclusion of the Decree which had been passed, committed itself to the doctrine of infallibility, and that it could not now recede. Kenrick replied that if infallibility was a supernatural grace, he would admit that it properly attached to a person; but it was not a supernatural grace infused from heaven, as the Archbishop of Westminster contended—a grace by which revealed truths are certainly attained and recognised. It was only the tradition of the Church, given and kept, that she might not tolerate errors in contradiction to truths divinely revealed, or in contradiction to their necessary consequences, and that she might not propound anything to the faithful by her supreme authority, which was not true. As to the claim that no conditions should attach to the exercise of infallibility, he said that doubtless that would be a royal road to the attainment of truth; but it would not be without danger, both to the Pontiff and to the Church. Let the Pontiff be once imbued with this persuasion, and the holier his life, the purer his intentions, the more fervent his piety, the greater might be the danger both for himself and for the Church, which, on this system, would borrow her infallibility from him. What would then arise if among his counsellors was found even one labouring under the same illusion? What would the counsels of brethren, the opinions of doctors, or the monuments of the Church be to a Pontiff who believed such things? Persuaded that he was led by the Divine Spirit, and that he communicated that Spirit to the Church, there would be nothing to restrain him from pressing on in any way on which he had once set out.

To the point that in passing the concluding portion of the Decree on the faith, they had already committed themselves to the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope, Kenrick replied that

¹ *Documenta*, i., 223.

the assertion of Manning was one of several things which he had heard with stupefaction. They had been assured, he stated, as we have already seen, in the clearest terms by the reporter of the committee, that the clause referred to contained no doctrine, and that it was only a fitting conclusion to the four chapters of the Decree. Then follows the statement already cited, to the effect that the reporter had either himself been deceived or had knowingly deceived the minority.

In the sitting of May 25th, MacEvilly, Bishop of Galway, also referred to Kenrick's argument, drawn from the fact that the Catholics of England and Ireland had been admitted to equal civil rights on the faith of repeated declarations, and even of oaths, to the effect that the doctrine of Papal infallibility was not binding on Catholics, and that consequently such edicts of Pontiffs as the Bull *Unam Sanctam* had not doctrinal authority. To this MacEvilly replied that the Catholics in England had been admitted to equal civil rights, not because of their declarations, but because the English government feared a civil war. The reply of Kenrick to this straightforward utterance is worthy of being given word for word:—

'The doctrine of Papal infallibility was always odious to the English government, and had it been really a doctrine of the faith, Protestants would have understood Papal doctrine better than English and Irish Catholics; for they knew that Roman Pontiffs had claimed the highest power in temporal things for themselves, and had attempted to drive several English kings from the throne by absolving their subjects from the oath of allegiance.

'Catholics, by public oath repeatedly made, denied that such power belonged to the Roman Pontiff in the realm of England, and had they not done so, they never would have been or ought to have been admitted to equal civil rights.' How the faith thus pledged to the British government is to be reconciled with the definition of Papal infallibility may be looked to by those of the Irish prelates who have taken that oath as I myself did. I cannot solve the difficulty as yet. I am Davus, not Oedipus. Nevertheless those civil rights were conceded to Catholics by men who through a long life had strongly opposed that course. They

¹ 'Quod si non fecissent nunquam ad libertatis civilis consortium admissi fuissent aut debuissent' (p. 219).

did indeed apprehend civil war ; but they did not dread it in this sense, that a war of that kind could not be otherwise hurtful to the power of the government than by causing a disturbance of the peace for a certain time.

' They feared the occurrence of a war, not the result of it, as to which no sensible man could have been uncertain. Those great men preferred to yield rather than to conquer by the slaughter of a brilliant nation, and of a people worthy of a better fate, even in what seemed to them its errors. Oh that here the same spirit of moderation which they exhibited may be displayed by the majority of the bishops who are listening to these words, and that by a prevision of the calamities which may arise to us from this hapless controversy, they may, in circumstances calling for consummate moderation, ward off from us, who are fewer, but who represent a greater number of Catholics than those who are opposed to us, evils which it is not possible to anticipate without horror, and which it would be impossible to repair by a late repentance.'

On the one hand, we cannot but regret that these words, fitly written, were not actually spoken in the deaf ears of the resolved majority. On the other hand, we remember that had they been spoken, they would have sunk into the Vatican archives, and would never have been heard of more till those graves give up their dead. They now belong to history, and furnish a living link in a chain of memorable professions and performances. The denationalising influence of the Papacy had still left something of the citizen alive in the soul of Kenrick. During his stay in Rome, when witnessing the paltry tyrannies that flounced about under the dependent banner of the Pope, all of the citizen that was left in him must have turned with fresh respect to the two flags of the free under which he had spent his days—the flags of England and America. And yet there were those sitting there, each with all the rights of a free man in his hands, planning to reconstruct the society of England and America on the degraded and fettered model of the States of the Roman Bishop. There is a crime which no code has defined—the crime, not of breaking one specific law of one's country, but of contriving, with a foreign pretender, how to overturn everything vital in a venerable and generous legislation.

It was not merely by a pupil of Maynooth that the eager ex-Anglican was considered extreme in his views. Clifford, Bishop of Clifton, spoke on the same day, refuting the notions of Manning about the favourable effects to be produced by his beloved dogma in England, and appealing to him as a witness that an eminent statesman had represented the influence of the recent course of the Curia upon public opinion in England as being much to the disadvantage of their own cause, and greatly to the encouragement of extreme Protestants.¹

In the next Congregation, on the 28th, it was Senestrey who took the post occupied on the last morning by Manning, that of official respondent against attacks. On that day, a scene was raised by Verot, of Florida. He declared that they were making innovations in the Church, and that such an innovation as the personal infallibility of the Pope was sacrilege. That horrid word applied in the sacred place to an object so dear to the Pope, touched indeed the apple of the eye. Sacrilege! The Cardinals de Angelis and Capalti, says Vitelleschi, quite lost their temper; and a scene ensued which for anger and excitement is said to have fallen but little short of Strossmayer's scene in March.² The odious, and to well-tuned Curialistic ears the inconceivable, task of hearing the infallibility of the Pope denied, and of seeing his pleasure daily thwarted under the roof of St. Peter's, was not to be endured any longer. The word passed that the power given by the new Rules to close the debate must be called into requisition.

A trusty American was set up in the next meeting, by the committee, to repair the mischief done by Verot—Spalding, of Baltimore. Here, again, we are indebted for light to Kenrick's unspoken speech. Referring to the moral question which had been raised by Kenrick, to which we have already seen allusions, Spalding said that it called for as much investigation to justify one in giving a negative as in giving an affirmative vote on the question of Papal infallibility, and that in

¹ *Quirinus*, 584.

² *Vitelleschi*, p. 168.

withholding an affirmative vote one would confirm the celebrated Gallican articles. Spalding, following in the footsteps of Cullen, quoted the words of Kenrick's brother, who formerly occupied his own See of Baltimore. But Kenrick shows by quotations in English, with a Latin translation, that Spalding's citation was imperfect, and that the doctrine of his brother was not the new but the old one, that of infallibility with the bishops. But he also turns upon Spalding words of his own, used in a work popular among Catholics in America, written in refutation of D'Aubigné's *History of the Reformation*.¹

'We learn for the first time that the Roman Chancery decided on articles of faith. We had always thought that this was the exclusive province of General Councils, and when they were not in session, of the Roman Pontiffs with the consent or acquiescence of the body of bishops dispersed over the world. We had, also, in our simplicity, believed that even these did not always decide on controverted points, but only in cases in which the teaching of revelation was clear and explicit; and that in other matters they wisely allowed a reasonable latitude of opinion. But D'Aubigné has taught us better.'—*History of the Reformation*, by Martin John Spalding, Archbishop of Baltimore; 5th ed., Baltimore, 1866, p. 318, vol. i.

On May 31st, Valerga, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, made a vigorous attack on the minority, speaking cleverly, and hitting hard. Spirited, *piquant*, and insolent, is the description of Quirinus. Soon afterwards, another American was in the desk, Purcell, of Cincinnati. Quirinus says that he affirmed that the Americans abhorred every doctrine opposed to civil and spiritual freedom; and that the American sons of the Church loved her, because she was the freest society in the world. He also took the position that, as kings existed for the good of the people, so the Pope existed for the good of the Church. On the same day spoke Conolly, Archbishop of Halifax. He seems to be the only one in the Council who really related a theological experience, declaring that he had formerly believed in the personal infallibility of the Pope, and

¹ *Documenta*, i., 208 and 206.

had come to Rome believing that the *Augsburg Gazette* had circulated a calumny in representing the dogmatising of this opinion as the real object of the Council. He went on to say that, on finding what was expected of him, he determined to sift the arguments of the Roman theologians and the proofs by which they supported them. He now bore witness to the result upon his own views. All antiquity, he declared, explained the passages harped upon by those theologians, in a sense different from theirs. All antiquity bore witness against the notion that the Pope alone, and separate from the bishops, was infallible. He further took the ground that to found a dogma on the rejection of the traditional interpretation of Scripture was pure Protestantism. I will have nothing, he said, turned into dogma but the indubitable Word of God. Ten thousand theologians do not suffice for me, and on the present subject no theologian should be quoted who lived subsequent to the Isidorean forgeries. To define the dogma would be to bring the Vatican Council into contradiction with the three General Councils which had condemned Pope Honorius as a heretic, to narrow the gates of heaven, to repel the East, and to proclaim, not peace, but war. In reply to Manning, he protested that no one was justified in calling an opinion proximate heresy when it had not been condemned as such by the Church.¹

On the 3rd of June, Gillooly, Bishop of Elphin, replying to some observation of Purcell as to the oaths and declarations, said² that Catholics had not denied that they held the infallibility of the Pope as a doctrine of the faith, but as a dogma of the faith; that is, as a dogma defined by a General Council. To this, Kenrick's unspoken speech replies, 'If that is what was meant, which I do not believe, we might be reproached, and that rightfully and deservedly, with not shrinking, in a very grave matter, from the concealment of our meaning by scholastic distinctions.'³ According to Quirinus (p. 661), Cardinal Bonne-

¹ *Quirinus*, p. 597.

² *Ibid.*, i., 215.

³ *Documenta*, i., 215.

chose prevailed upon Cardinal de Angelis to ask the Pope, directly, if he would not consent to a prorogation of the Council on account of the heat, now intolerable to all but Romans, or men from the southward of Rome. The reply was stern and, according to many, savage. Whatever were the terms of it, the substance was indubitable—no adjournment was to be allowed till the Decree of Infallibility was passed. It is said that when Bishop Domenec, of Pittsburg, in America, began his discourse, he was greeted with laughter by the majority, and when he made the very plain and simple statement—one which he might have picked up from any intelligent or travelled Italian any day in the year—that American Catholics were not merely nominal ones, as the Italians were, Cardinal Capalti imperiously commanded silence.¹ Strossmayer had spoken at length on the 2nd of June, and with such moderation as to escape even a call to order, yet, it is said, with very great force. On the 3rd, Moriarty, of Kerry, took the side of Purcell, Kenrick, and MacHale, but we have no particulars of his speech.² That day Maret was in the desk speaking in the loud and labouring tone of a deaf man, arguing, not only against the convictions and feelings of the majority, but against their personal detestation of himself. He made a point that either the Council was to give infallibility to the Pontiff, in which case the Council must be a higher authority than he, or else the Pontiff was to give to himself an infallibility which he had not previously possessed, in which case he would change the constitution of the Church by his own power alone. Then Cardinal Bilio interrupted, and cried, ‘The Council does not give anything, nor can it give anything. It gives its suffrage, and the Holy Father decides what he pleases.’³ The representative of all that was left of the once courageous Gallican liberties asked if he might be allowed to proceed, and did so. The minority had a long list of speakers still inscribed. Kenrick was waiting for his turn, and so were Haynald, Dupanloup,

¹ *Quirinus*, p. 661.

² His name does not occur in the *Acta Sanctae Sedis* for the third.

³ *Quirinus*, p. 608.

and many others; but a fresh surprise was at this point sprung upon them. The movement which had originated after Verot's scene a few days before, for closing the debate on the general question, now took effect. The Presidents produced a requisition for the close of the general debate, signed by above one hundred and fifty bishops.¹ De Angelis at once called on those who were for the closing of the debate to stand up. He then declared, 'A large majority have stood up, and by the power conferred upon us by Our Most Holy Lord (the capitals are official), we close the debate on the general question.' Friedberg says that nineteen-twentieths voted for closing the debate. The *Acta Sanctae Sedis* say that about fifty remained sitting, which would be nearer to one in ten than to one in twenty. No wonder that, after hearing sixty-five speakers, the Fathers were weary. Yet, no wonder, on the other hand, that the minority should allege that, while it was perfectly reasonable to close a debate in this manner when the object was that of making temporal laws liable to be unmade, or re-made, a year later, it was neither reasonable nor fair, and above all, it was not agreeable to any precedent, to past professions, or to any ecclesiastical principle, to close a debate upon a dogma while yet there were prelates wanting to bear witness to the tradition of their respective Churches. According to all their theologians, dogma was not to be made by mere opinion, but by evidence of the fact that the opinion in question had been believed from the beginning. Protestants would naturally say that it was time to bury this pretence under any heap; but men whose life had been spent under the illusion of the pretence naturally felt otherwise. They had not seen that when the Church adopted the principle of tradition instead of that of Scripture, the Spouse, while professing only to supplement the word of her Lord, really entered on a course which must lead to setting it aside in favour of her own word, and that when she had adopted the principle of

¹ *Acta Sanctae Sedis.* Friedberg, p. 47, says there were two hundred and fifty signatures, but this is evidently a mistake.

general consent, instead of that of clear apostolical tradition, she had set aside the principle of antiquity for that of a majority amounting to a moral whole, and that now she was only proceeding a step further in substituting the principle of a numerical majority for that of moral unanimity. But one step more remained, and that was not far off. The Spouse who had put aside the authority of her Lord to exalt her own, was to find, not only her authority, but even her consent, formally repudiated before all men by the master whom she had, in the house of her Lord, set up in His place. In that house the talk was evermore of her authority, her wisdom, her infallibility, her glory, her stores of merit and her streams of blessing, and but rarely was her Lord heard of, except as having conferred the regency on her. Now drew nigh the day when the self-asserting Spouse was, before all men whom her loud vauntings had aroused, to receive on her brow such a stigma from her self-chosen Master as has seldom in set terms been affixed to a society by its head. Meantime the blow which had just been dealt seemed fatal to all the hopes of the minority. So once more they dragged their robes down the marble way of St. Peter's with defeat behind them, but this time with annihilation close before, though not till after further strange experiences.

CHAPTER VI.

To the Close of the Special Debate on Infallibility, July 4th—Proposal of the Minority to resist—They yield once more—Another Protest—Efforts to procure Unanimity—Hope of the Minority in Delay—Pope disregards the Heat—Disgrace of Theiner—Decree giving to Pope ordinary Jurisdiction everywhere—His Superiority to Law—Debate on Infallibility.—Speech of Guidi—Great Emotion—Scene with the Pope—Close of the Debate—Present view of the *Civiltà* as to Politics—Specimens of the Official Histories—Exultation.

A NY one who had observed the course of the minority in emergencies would have probably foretold that, under the new trial, they would feel indignant, would speak of doing something, and would end with a protest. So it proved. The

very day of the forcible conclusion of the general debate, the French bishops met, and were favourable to some determined action.¹ But the next day, eighty congregated in the rooms of Cardinal Rauscher. The Hungarians, French, and Americans, with Strossmayer, Clifford, and Conolly, are named by Quirinus as recommending that the Fathers of the Opposition should cease to take any part in the Council, reserving themselves for the final vote, and should then give their *Non placet*. The Germans, however, always marplots, urged that the better course would be to adopt a protest, and continue to take part in the proceedings. This counsel prevailed. Rauscher drew up a form of protest, which was signed by some eighty prelates, and many of the bishops took a trip to Naples or elsewhere.

Among the things represented by Quirinus as having been said on this occasion, one was to the effect that in a Parliament speeches were of some use, for if they did not influence votes, they did enlighten public opinion; but in this Council, most of the hearers were, from their degree of culture, quite incapable of apprehending theological arguments, not to add that, in a moral point of view, many of them stood so low that even if convinced they would not act on their convictions. The ground taken in the protest is clear, namely, that the right of supporting their votes by a statement of reasons, is one which, by the very nature of a Council, belongs not only to some of its members, but to them all, and that such a right could not be taken away by any vote of a majority.

The Hungarians now declared that they would take no further part in the debates. On the other hand, the *Unità Cattolica* foretold how those who had written or spoken as Gallicans would be converted by a miracle of the Holy Ghost,

¹ It seems that the Bishop of Orleans, and most of the French prelates in opposition, wished to make a solemn protest against the treatment they had met with; against the advantage taken of the hot season to weary them; against the want of fairness shown towards them by the Presidents all through the discussion; and, lastly, against the excesses, insults, and affronts of which the majority had been guilty with regard to them. Having made this protest, they proposed to leave Rome immediately.—*Vitelleschi*, p. 200.

even in the Council Hall ; and as the Galileans had been constrained to speak in other tongues, so would the Gallicans be constrained to proclaim in that Hall before the astonished multitudes the doctrine they had gainsaid.¹

The absorbing care of the Curia and its instruments was now directed to the one end of constraining all to vote *placet*. The victory was no longer doubtful, but to procure unanimity was of great practical moment. The Pope himself was indefatigable. His admirers resented such epithets as ‘unscrupulous’ when applied to his conduct. But they took good care not to grapple with the details of alleged facts which, if they could be credibly told about the conduct of one of our sovereigns in respect to his nobles or to Parliament, would be described in much stronger epithets than unscrupulous. His tongue was evermore scattering rebukes or blandishments, and enlivening the city with crackling sparks of gossip. There were but few bishops of note among the minority whose portraits, etched by the infallible acid, were not handed round the *salons*, lay and clerical. His letters were bitter and undignified. Quirinus quotes the words of a French bishop (p. 627): ‘There is no longer any scruple as to what is done to gain votes. It is a horror. There has never been anything like it in the Church.’ These words recall to us a scene in Rome. A remarkable head—one of those heads which bear on the brow a diploma of gifts and letters—was stooping in the light of a lamp by which pages had been penned that had been heard of beyond Italy. The stoop was pensive, and the thinker said, ‘I saw so much of what was done during that Council, that it has destroyed all my faith in any thing that ever was done in the Church before.’

It would seem as if, at the last, argument and appeal had begun to tell on some of those who were of a milder mood among the Curialists. It is said that even of the chosen three champions, Manning, Deschamps, and Pie, the last wished to

¹ *Quirinus*, p. 624.

find some formula less offensive than the one projected. Martin of Paderborn even proposed a note which contained a recognition of the teaching authority of bishops, though in an indirect way. On the other hand, the members of the Opposition tried to discover some turn of expression which would save the Church from the shame of being publicly disavowed by her wilful lord. Conolly spoke of proposing, as a formula which would still give her a recognised voice, words declaring the Pope infallible when he spoke 'as head of the Church teaching with him.' Others again wished to reinstate the formula of St. Antoninus, of Florence, declaring the Pope infallible when he acts with the counsel of the universal Church.¹

Men now began to realise the full effect of the proposed dogma, both in its executive and in its retrospective aspects. Many must have remembered how happy they had been in argument, or in diplomacy, when the ambiguous state of the case, as it had hitherto existed, enabled them to evade the charge that such and such were the principles of the Church. It was so convenient to be able to say No, they have never

¹ We have avoided noting the charges of misquotation and falsification of authorities made on the one side and on the other. It would be endless. A most curious specimen of the curiosities of literature might be compiled by treating that one feature of the innumerable pamphlets, articles, and reviews included in the literature of the controversy. A painful specimen of the condition of respect for letters, not to say for theology, of fair play, of honesty, of reverence for history, and of faith in the candour of ecclesiastics, would such a monograph be. Quirinus gives the formula of St. Antoninus as *utens* or *accipiens consilium ecclesiae universalis*. One of the great organs accuses some one of substituting *concilium* for *consilium*, but does not itself allow the following words, *ecclesiae universalis*, to appear. The difference is thus made to seem simply that which lies between acting with counsel or acting with a Council, instead of being a difference between using the counsel of the universal Church, and acting without any counsel at all. Even the mildest form of St. Antoninus's words would impose upon the Pope the necessity of taking counsel, and thus would deny his own infallibility as the sufficing source of all dogmatic teaching. Of course the new doctrine recognises no limitation or condition whatsoever. It was natural that Manning, with the 'Anglican' capacity for fallacies, should take the words of Antoninus for a statement of his own doctrine; but men like Haynald on one side, and Kenrick on the other, knew how wide was the difference in sense, under an approximation in sound.

been sanctioned by a Council ; they are only the words of a Papal Decree. Now, however, all these words were to have fresh life breathed into them, and whatever they contained affecting a general principle of belief, or practice, was to be taken for divine,—was, in fact, to rank as the word of God. As specimens, Quirinus quotes the language of that very infallible person Leo X.: ‘It is clear as the noonday sun that the Popes, my predecessors, have never erred in their canons or constitutions.’ The complement to this he takes from the Syllabus,—‘The Popes never exceeded the limits of their power’ (p. 634). Another case put by him is curious. Eugenius IV. decreed that in the Sacrament of Orders, the matter of the Sacrament is the delivery of the Eucharistic vessels, and the form of the Sacrament is the words of delivery. If this be so, the Church had no ordained priests for a thousand years ; for up to the time of Eugenius IV. it had always been held that the matter of the Sacrament was the imposition of the bishop’s hands. For our own part, we see no difficulty here that need for a moment detain men who call a Church infallible which, according to them, had for eighteen hundred years kept her divinely appointed head out of the due recognition of his assigned place; still less need it detain men who can say that the assigned place was from the beginning recognised, in the face of all that occurred in the years 1869 and 1870 in order to obtain its recognition.

Delay now became the forlorn hope of the minority, and expedition the watchword of the majority. The minority were sure that the Pope would not be so cruel as to force them to continue in Rome during the summer heats. Hence, they thought that by delay they were certain of a prorogation before the fatal deed was done. They forgot the history of the Pope’s prisons and executions. Perhaps they had never read it, or had used their fatal facility of calling an unpleasant statement a lie. Antonelli had generally carried away the chief part of the blame for the blood of the political victims.

However, he seems completely to have escaped reproach for the broiling of the bishops. Whether the fierce language ascribed to the Pope was correct or not, nobody doubted its aptness.¹ When even the faithful M. Veillot said, Since they have put the Council upon the gridiron, they shall broil (ii., p. 352), every one treated him as only echoing the language of his idol. When once the heats had begun to tell, the feelings of majority and minority, as Vitelleschi points out, changed. Men from the north, accustomed to the bracing air and pure streams of Germany, could ill bear up against the miasma from the Roman marshes and the torrid heats that were withering the city and making even natives look pale. They therefore began to long for an escape, and not a few of them took their way homewards. They received not only ready but glad permission. Thus every day was diminishing the strength of the Opposition. The majority, on the other hand, consisting of Italians, South Americans, and Spaniards, were inured to the heats, if not to the malaria, and felt that the sun and the marshes were conspiring with them. Apollo had come to camp shooting over the heads of the natives, but laying low the men from beyond the sea.

There was now only one consideration that would make the Pope anxious for despatch, and that was the daily pressure upon his finances caused by supporting his three hundred boarders. This certainly had proved a useful ground of appeal for funds. The sums collected everywhere had been great. The *Civiltà* reproaches the Liberal Catholics with not sending money any more than they had sent men to fight for the Holy Father, and sets in contrast with their stinginess and want of military spirit the fact that the *Univers* alone had sent in more than nine thousand pounds (234,410 francs).² The Holy Father said, 'They fear making the Pope infallible, but they

¹ Quirinus says that he should think it a sin to print it, but that the Romans freely credited and repeated it.

² Serie VII., xi., p. 94.

do not fear making him fail.¹ But M. Veuillot, on the contrary, did not fear making him infallible, and did everything possible to prevent him from failing. Hence it was no wonder that he should have briefs to publish which would perform a service for the exchequer of the *Univers* similar to what the *Univers* performed for the exchequer of the author of the briefs. The words of the Pope spoken to the deputation of scientific men were representative words, ‘Here I am to receive your offerings.’

Theiner, the celebrated Prefect of the Vatican archives, now fell publicly under displeasure. He had allowed Hefele and Strossmayer, and perhaps others, to see the order of procedure of the Council of Trent, and probably had in other ways shown leanings not acceptable to the Jesuits. He was ordered to give up his keys to Cardoni, who had been the first chosen secretly to prepare Drafts of Decrees on Infallibility before intentions were disclosed, and had kept his counsel well. The archives were actually closed against Theiner. It is said that the passage into them from his own rooms was walled up. The disgrace of Theiner, and the honour of Cardoni, sharply symbolised the favourite saying that the dogma must conquer history. Here again Antonelli escaped all reproach of a share in the blundering injustice. Cardoni was one singled out by name in a celebrated letter of Döllinger as having largely employed falsified authorities. But that charge, to us so revolting, is a familiar sound wherever the shadow of the Curia extends.² We ourselves once heard a member of the Congregation of the Index exclaim, unmindful of the presence of a Protestant, ‘You must never trust any edition of any work whatever that has passed through the hands of the Jesuits.’

The exciting matters now remaining to be treated in the Council were the all-important particulars of those Drafts

¹ *Veuillot*, ii., p. 389.

² Friedberg, 688; or a French translation in *Le Concile du Vat. et le Mouvement Anti-infallibiliste*, p. 212.

which had already been under a general review. The general discussion had ranged over all the chapters of the proposed Decree. It now remained to examine them severally. The first and second chapters caused little debate, partly because the subjects of them were those on which there was substantial agreement, and partly because men were too sore under the effects of the late blow. So the two chapters teaching the institution of the primacy in the person of Peter, and the transmission of that primacy through the Roman Pontiffs as his successors, were speedily disposed of. Had all the Fathers attempted to answer the arguments of Desanctis on these points, arguments familiar to many Italians, they would not have found it light work. But the third chapter was one of immense importance. It defined the scope and nature of primacy, distending that term till it was made to cover absolute, immediate, and ordinary control in the whole domain of the Church—control over bishops and people, control over not only all matters ordinarily included under the expression ‘faith and morals,’ but over all things held to be necessary for the government or discipline of the Church. This last expression, as any one acquainted with the views of those in authority, even so far as they are recorded in our preceding pages, must know, covers almost every possible question that can arise. The words of Vitelleschi (p. 174) are well considered. He speaks of the ‘supreme jurisdiction, ordinary and universal, of the Pope over all Churches, singly and collectively, over pastors as well as flocks ; from which doctrine it follows that bishops in exercising any jurisdiction or authority, only do so as official delegates of the Pope.’ Dr. Langen puts it thus : ‘Seeing that there can be only one bishop in a diocese, as soon as the Pope is declared to have ordinary jurisdiction in that diocese, he becomes its Ordinary, and the other person called a bishop is nothing more than his delegate and representative.’¹ Men who cover a dominion of this sort under the pretext of primacy, and who

¹ *Das Vatikanische Dogma*, p. 5.

advance a claim of primacy in order to deduce from it an absolute dictatorship, never do anything more sensible than when they decry reason and relegate Scripture to the tradition-heap ; when they call for pictures instead of books, and processions and fireworks instead of a free press and free discussion. There was political philosophy in M. Veuillot's exclamation on witnessing the Easter rejoicings in Rome, especially the fireworks representing 'the heavenly Jerusalem,' that it was impossible not to respect a people for whom such entertainments were provided.

The first assertion in the Decree of ordinary and immediate jurisdiction over all Churches, oddly does not describe that jurisdiction as belonging to the Pope, but as belonging to the Roman Church (par. 2). The principle that a bishop derives his position and authority from his Church was to be practically upset, and the principle that the Pope derives any authority from the universal Church was to be formally disavowed. But that principle incidentally reappears in this logical slip. According to the new dogma, the Church, whether that of Rome or that of the whole world, derives everything from the Pope. Hence, when the first source of jurisdiction indicated is the Church, the slip is one in logic as well as in theology. That a municipal Church should have universal authority is the sound old principle —old, so long as you take Rome for the mother of Jerusalem. No sooner, however, has principality been ascribed to the Roman Church than it is instantly transferred to the Pontiff, and is again instantly affirmed to be a truly episcopal power. This confusion, in such a document, would be amusing if the matter were not so serious. That a Church should be a bishop is certainly new ; and that a truly episcopal power should reside in a Church which is not a bishop, is one of the many mysteries created by the Vatican Council. But that the source of the Pontiff's authority should in this very Decree be sought in the Church, is a proof how hard a task is theirs who determine to make dogma conquer history. In the very language of the

Decree, history conquers the dogma. A geologist could as easily remove proofs of animal life from the rocks that underlie the recent soil as could the art of priests remove from their own dogma the proof that it is a new deposit.

If the document contains this one taint of dualism as between Church and Pope, it is clear of all reproach of dualism as between the Pope and princes. The latter are legislated out of all rights that could possibly conflict with those of their Lord Paramount. Notwithstanding the slight dualism as between Pope and Church, the latter is also legislated out of all her ancient claims ; but incidentally she appears in clauses which, if she was only infallible without the consent of the Pope, as he is infallible without her consent, might in time prove very awkward. He has only as much infallibility as she has : that is a clumsy admission just before the assertion that he is infallible without her consent. However, wherever the power resides, or springs from, it is a power over all pastors and all believers, and extends, as we have said, not only to faith and morals, but to all things which affect the government of the Church. Thus it includes every mixed question whatsoever, and all things of any kind which in the estimation of the Pope of Rome may relate to the interests of that kingdom of which he is the king. This power, moreover, is immediate, and as such can act without being legally restricted to any processes, any agencies, or any forms. Being ordinary, it can never be obliged to wait until the ordinary jurisdiction has been tried and failed. Being immediate, it can never be told that it must take this, that, or the other line of procedure. This language for ever settles the point which had been contested in the famous passage of letters with Darboy.

An absurdity in government so great as that of one Church having 'ordinary' jurisdiction over another, and of supposing a Church fixed in one place to have 'immediate' jurisdiction over all in every place, would be pronounced too glaring for any one to put on paper, were it not before us, and irreform-

able too. If the Roman Church had such authority, she might of course give it to her Bishop. But all history goes for nought if the Bishop of Rome, having it, would ever have given it to his Church. How it could be necessary to add another word after these affirmations we can hardly see. Even Councils, or the pastors collectively, had but one office assigned to them—the office of obeying. After this the abstract proclamation of Infallibility, or Irreformability, or Inerrancy, could add nothing to a power that was universal, ordinary, and immediate, and towards which the people or bishops, singly or collectively, stood in one relation only—that of subjects in presence of an authority which they were bound absolutely to obey. It naturally follows that it is in this obedience that Rome finds unity. That is, in fact, her ideal of unity. Christians are Churchmen, not by being Christians, but by obeying the Roman Pontiff. Men are *homines*, not by being men, but by obeying Cæsar. There is one emperor, and all who obey him are men, and all who do not are barbarians. Still, under the Emperors a man might be a man, although he was not a Roman ; but under the Papacy a Christian is outside the family of God if he does not obey the Cæsar of the Church.

Absolute authority over bishops and people having been asserted, next comes the assertion of authority over princes. This is done in a paragraph in which only students would see anything of the kind. The fourth paragraph of the third chapter begins by speaking of the Pope's right to free communication with the pastors and flocks of the whole Church. What could appear more natural, or less dangerous? Had we not seen how much the communications of the Pope amount to, we should have taken that as a meek and harmless claim. But the close of the paragraph shows that what the Pope means is the right of giving to his own edicts the binding force of a higher law in every country, whether the government consents or does not consent. As primacy means dictatorship, so communication means promulgating laws in regard to which no human

being has the right of reply, inquiry, complaint, or appeal; has, we repeat, no office whatever except that of obedience. We have seen that 'teach' in our Lord's commission to the apostles means so to give law to the *nations* that they can never be justified in resisting. No prince can have any title to exercise an *exequatur, placet*, or any other form of check upon an edict of the Pope. Every man who denies the validity of a Papal law, because it is prohibited by the government of the country, is solemnly condemned; he interrupts the communication between the authority of the Pontiff and the conscience of his subjects. Indeed, the condemnation extends to all who even say that his decrees may be lawfully impeded in their execution. The reason of this appears in the next paragraph. The Pope is there formally declared the Supreme Judge of the faithful. Therefore all may justly resort to his judgment in all matters subject to ecclesiastical inquiry, and none may appeal from his judgment, for there is no authority greater than his. Matters subject to ecclesiastical enquiry must always include all those wherein the interests of the Papacy are in anywise involved. Next, even the old appeal to a General Council is formally condemned. Yet even that condemnation is bungled. None may appeal from the judgment of the Pope to a General Council 'as an authority superior to the Roman Pontiff.' Then, will lawyers say, we can only appeal to a General Council as an authority equal to the Roman Pontiff.

If these fourth and fifth paragraphs of the third chapter of the Decree on Primacy were read by a dozen educated Englishmen unused to Roman Catholic interpretations of Papal laws, nearly all of them would put aside clause after clause as not being of importance. They would take the *damnamus* and *reprobamus* as so much sulphur, and let it pass. Far otherwise Vitelleschi. 'From a practical point of view,' he says, 'the declarations of infallibility could add nothing to the weight of this paragraph' (p. 177). The Englishmen would say, In a practical point of view this free communication amounts

to nothing. They would be inclined to say, How could serious consequences follow from the simple assertion of the right to issue law, and the condemning and reprobating of all who hold that the permission of the civil authority is needful to its having the force of law, followed by asserting the right of all to appeal to the Pope, and asserting that none may appeal from him? 'Because,' replies the Roman, 'if the Pope is raised above human judgment, whatever consequences may ensue to the Church, he is, in fact, infallible.' We may add that, if he is raised above all human check, whatever consequences may ensue to the State, he is, in fact, its irresponsible suzerain. After these muffled but most mighty paragraphs, Vitelleschi looks upon the express declaration of infallibility, in the next chapter, as no more than 'indulgence in the luxury of self-assertion, to which absolute principles are prone.' Yet when Mr. Gladstone pointed out the true range of the authority here set up, many of our politicians treated him as a statesman who had strayed out of his domain into theology. Since then, specimens of minimising interpretation have been put into our own tongue, as curious as any furnished by the history of *finesse*. If there be one Canon expressing a rule absolute that needs no exception to prove it, we have it in the words, Rome never minimises. She always interprets her own documents as a legatee interprets a will, that is, in her own favour.

On the 15th of June the Council disposed of all the matters that stood in the way of the great question. Seventy-five speakers had entered their names. Two speeches were actually made on that day by Cardinals Mathieu and Rauscher.¹ The latter said that he could never assent to the doctrine of the Draft without mortal sin. 'We knew all that from your pamphlet,' cried Deschamps, interrupting. 'But you have never refuted it,' replied the Austrian.² The following day was the grand procession of the Corpus Christi. If the 'good press' was parsimonious in information regarding debates and

¹ *Stimmen and Acta Sanctae Sedis.*

² *Quirinus*, p. 684.

decrees, it was profuse in description of the spectacles. On the 17th, Pius IX. entered on the twenty-fifth year of his pontificate. This year, according to Roman tradition, is fatal to the Pontiffs, it being held that Peter reigned twenty-five years, and that none of his successors was to reign longer. Vitelleschi declares that the twenty-fifth year proved fatal to Pius IX., as well as to the rest, because in the course of it he ceased to be a mere mortal. This phrase from a Liberal Catholic will seem natural when set beside one of M. Veuillot, on the day on which Pius IX. completed the twenty-fifth year of his pontificate : ‘We are reminded of the radiance of Jordan and of Tabor, of the thunders of the Temple, “This is my beloved Son, hear ye him”’ (vol. ii., p. 468). On the next page he says, ‘God has left us His priest, His angel, the sacred interpreter of His law, the anointed intercessor between Him and the world . . . a second Peter, a second Moses on the threshold of a new world.’ It remains to be seen whether the twenty-fifth year of Pius IX. was or was not that of the final fall of the temporal power. If the speeches on the doctrine and polity of the Church were concealed, the Pope’s speech this day, in reply to the Sacred College, was blazed abroad. He divided the bishops into three classes—the ignorant, the time-serving, and the good. So flowed abroad fresh streams from that fountain which, all the time, was sending forth both sweet waters and bitter.

On the 18th of June, the debate on the fourth chapter, that is, on infallibility, really began. It was a day of Cardinals. Pitra, Guidi, Bonnechose, and Cullen were the sole orators. Hitherto, what with the heat and what with the feeling that all was over, no interest had attached to the renewed debates after the violent close of the general discussion. But the torpor was suddenly shaken. A speech by a Roman, a Dominican and a Cardinal (Guidi), came upon the city, says Vitelleschi, like a sudden thunderclap in a cloudless sky. The Cardinal, like nearly all the members of the Sacred College, was a ‘creature’

of Pius IX. According to Vitelleschi, he began his speech as a Cardinal should, but, according to Quirinus, he offended at the very first. Unhappily, in a matter of difference of this kind, the writers who enjoyed ‘the radiance of infallibility’ give us no light. So we are left at the mercy of those whose assertions were all lies in general, but somehow, when attacked in detail, generally proved to be truths in particular. In the present case, we do not remember that even M. Veuillot attempts to impugn any of the facts stated. However Guidi may have begun, he affirmed that the doctrine of Papal infallibility, as contained in the proposed Decree, was unknown to the Church up to the close of the fourteenth century. Proofs of this doctrine were to be sought in vain in either Scripture or tradition. As a practical question, when had the Pope ever defined one dogma alone, and without the Church? An act, he continued, might be infallible, but a person never. Hitherto, infallible acts had proceeded from the Church, either by counsel of the Church dispersed, or by a Council. Inquiry was indispensable to ascertain ‘what was believed everywhere, and whether all Churches were in agreement with the Roman Church.’ After such inquiry, the Pope sanctioned ‘finally,’ as St. Thomas says; and thus only could it be said that ‘all taught through the Pope.’ Quoting Bellarmine, and even the modern Jesuit Perrone, he showed that ‘the Popes had never acted by themselves alone in defining doctrine, or by themselves alone in condemning heresies.’ At these words, *Spacca-pietra*, an Italian, but Bishop of Smyrna, led in a disturbance. One bishop cried ‘Scoundrel!’ another cried ‘Brigand!’ Vitelleschi even speaks of violent gestures (p. 189). Guidi said he had the right to be heard, and that no one had given the right of the Presidents to the bishops; but he added, ‘You will have the opportunity of saying *Placet* or *Non placet*.’ Hereupon, from all ranks of the Opposition burst out a cry of ‘*Optime! optime!*—excellent! excellent! ‘Do you agree with us?’ asked a bishop of Manning. ‘The Cardinal’s head is bewildered,’ was

the reply. On this, says Quirinus, a bishop could not refrain from saying to the powerful Archbishop of Westminster, 'It is your own head, Monsignor, that is bewildered, and more than half Protestant.' If this language was really used, we must doubt whether it was infallible.

Guidi went on to advocate a change in the wording of the Decree, to the effect that the Pope acted with the concurrence of the bishops, and that after having, at their request, occasioned by prevalent errors, made inquiry in other Churches, he acted with the consent of his brethren, or with that of a collective Council. He contended that this was the doctrine of St. Thomas; that the word 'final' implied something to precede, and that 'supreme teacher and judge' presupposed 'other teachers and tribunals.' He concluded by proposing two Canons, the first of which declared Papal Decrees or Constitutions to be entitled to cordial faith and reverence, and not to be reformable; but the second said, If any one shall say that, in issuing such Decrees, the Pope can act arbitrarily without the counsel of the bishops as testifying to the tradition of the Church, let him be anathema.¹ On finishing his discourse, he at once handed his manuscript to the secretaries.

Quirinus relates that Valerga audibly said, in reply to some question, 'Guidi is misguided.' But his neighbour replied that Guidi's speech contained nothing but the truth. 'Yes,' rejoined the Patriarch of Jerusalem, 'but it is not always expedient to speak the truth.' The excitement was great. Groups of prelates who had left the Hall might be seen standing about everywhere in earnest conversation, while within doors Bonnechose and Cullen were discoursing to a thin audience with absent minds. It was related that Guidi did not speak as a solitary individual, but represented fifteen bishops belonging to the Order of Dominicans. He had gathered them together in the central convent of the Minerva, where he himself resided. They had considered the question, and accepted the views which he had now presented

¹ *Friedtorg*, p. 144.

to the Council. This was much against the feeling of Father Jandel, their general, who was perfectly free from any taint of the episcopal system, a thoroughly right-minded Papist. Guidi asked how the Cardinals had taken his speech, and Cardinal Mathieu replied, 'With serious and silent approval.'

Rumours were soon afloat in Rome as to what followed between Guidi and his royal master. What we now give is traced by Quirinus to the authority of the Pope himself, who is notoriously fond of telling the people with whom he chats how he has lectured this or that dignitary.¹

The 'creature' was summoned to the presence of his master soon after the sitting, and was greeted with the words, 'You are my enemy. You are the *coryphaeus* of my opponents. Ungrateful towards my person, you have propounded heretical doctrine.' 'My speech is in the hands of your Presidents, if your Holiness will read it and detect what is supposed to be heretical in it. I gave it at once to the Under-Secretary, that people might not be able to say that anything had been interpolated into it.'² 'You have given great offence to the majority of the Council. All five Presidents are against you, and are displeased.' 'Some material error may have escaped me, but certainly not a formal one. I have simply stated the doctrine of tradition, and of St. Thomas.' 'I am tradition. I will require you to make the profession of faith anew. *La tradizione son' io, vi farò far nuovamente la professione di fede.*' 'I am and remain subject to the authority of the Holy See, but I venture to discuss a question not yet made an article of faith. If your Holiness decides it to be such in a Constitution, I certainly shall not dare to oppose it.' 'The value of your

¹ *Quirinus*, p. 714.

² The *Difficultés de la Situation* says that Guidi replied, 'Holy Father, I have spoken to-day what I taught for many years, in broad daylight, in your College of the Minerva, without any one ever having found my doctrine blameable. The orthodoxy of my teaching must have been certified to your Holiness when you selected me to go to Vienna to combat certain German doctors whose principles were shaking the foundations of the Catholic faith.' Printed in French in the Appendix III. to *Quirinus* (p. 848).

speech may be measured by those whom it has pleased. Who has been eager to testify to you his joy? That Bishop Strossmayer, who is my personal enemy, has embraced you. You are in collusion with him.' 'I do not know him, and have never before spoken to him.' 'It is clear you have spoken so as to please the world, the Liberals, the Revolution, and the government of Florence.' 'Holy Father, have the goodness to have my speech given to you.'

It was said that the Pope stated afterwards that he had not sent for Guidi as a Cardinal, but as Brother Guidi, whom he had himself lifted out of the dust. The saying, 'I am tradition,' made an impression in Rome much like the celebrated one of the French monarch, 'I am the State.' It simply packed up and labelled the thought that had been more or less confusedly before the minds of all. Quirinus speaks of having often had the words 'I am the Church' in his thoughts—*l'Eglise c'est moi*. We do not see that the Pope could have said anything more sensible or more exactly representing the theology and history which the favourite champions had put before the world. Quirinus very properly thinks that this formula fits well with the pregnant saying of Boniface VIII., 'The Pope holds all rights locked up in his breast.' Truths and rights go together. Tradition consists of truths, and the Pope is all truth. Rights are based upon the truths, and the Pope holds them all in his own breast. And if the poor old man himself at last uttered these sad words, it was only after the incense had smoked around him thousands and thousands of times, hiding the realities of heaven from him by clouds that were only fumes. For this others were responsible, at least in part. Under the influence of it, what wonder if his senses had become confused? Mankind will have reason to be thankful that one Pope lived long enough to be thoroughly overcome by the smoke of the sacrifices. The ordinary reason assigned in Rome for Popes being short-lived is, that it is necessary to prevent the effects of their power upon themselves. The *gravamen* of Guidi's offence

could not be removed by any subsequent submission. Seeing that the Canon he proposed had emerged into the light, the record could not be got out of the book of history that a Dominican, a divine of repute, a Cardinal in high credit, did up to that last hour of liberty hold that it was a heresy worthy of anathema to affirm the very doctrine which was soon to be part of ‘the faith.’ The record could not be prevented from going down to future ages that what was, on the 18th of June and under the dome of St. Peter’s, liable to be called a heresy, was on the 18th of July under the same dome, promulgated by the voice of the Pope as truth, and as binding on every human being who would be saved. Nor can craft ever blot out from the history of the eccentricities of intellect the instance offered by the fact that after this had been done, grave and learned men, even of advanced age and high office, went throughout the civilised world soberly affirming that the only reason why the dogma was then proclaimed, was that it had been clearly revealed by our Lord and His apostles, and had in every age been held as revealed truth by all Catholics, in all places. It is often remarked how expeditiously political revolutions—especially from above—are effected in Roman Catholic countries, both in the Old World and the New. But we do not always realise the fact that in the theology of those countries what is a debatable heresy to-day may be part of your religion to-morrow.

Vitelleschi is not quite clear as to whether all the incidents reported of the interview between the Pope and the Cardinal were correct. To him that is of no importance; Roman-like, he did not want anything to illustrate the relation of the Pope to his courtiers or to the Church. A few such scenes, more or less, would to him make no difference whatever.

As if to prepare for the deeds directly tending to the restoration of facts when the Council should have completed the restoration of ideas, the tales of the *Crusaders of St. Peter* continued to appear side by side with the notices of the legislative proceedings in the

successive numbers of the *Civiltà*. To us one episode comes near home. It was on an April day that a company leaving Rome bore across the Campagna, with all the solemnity of a relic of the saints, the heart of one whose body, in the Agro Verano, the cemetery of St. Lorenzo, slept close by the tombs of the ancient martyrs, and amid those of the martyrs of Mentana. As the party reached a point on the hill within a few steps of the village,—a point from which St. Peter's appeared in the distance,—they saw a block of white marble, surrounded by four little columns, hung round by an iron chain. ‘Here,’ cried some zouaves who were of the party,—‘Here is the spot to which Julian pushed on, chasing the enemies of God with fire and sword, passing through a thousand bullets, of which one carried away his cap; and here he fell shot down at point blank.’ Above the marble block rose ‘the cross of Mentana,’ and on it was cut the inscription, ‘Here fell, fighting for the See of St. Peter, Julian Watts-Russell, pontifical zouave, a young Englishman of 17 years and 10 months old, the most youthful who fell on the field of victory, and the nearest to Mentana.’ In this ‘angelic sepulchre,’ as the courtly historian calls it, the solemn party deposited their holy relic. Around were grouped the villagers, with a few zouaves, among whom were Mr. Vansittart, who had come to take up the arms of his fallen friend, and Wilfred Watts-Russell, the brother and the fellow-crusader of Julian. The rites were celebrated by a venerable old man, yet, says the narrator, a new priest, who now, perhaps, for the first time performed the funeral service. It was the father of Julian and Wilfred. ‘As we returned,’ moralises the zealous historian, ‘we felt that we had committed to the ground the seed of martyrs.’¹

After the Guidi incident the debate dragged on. The heats were growing worse and worse. Men from the north were failing, the Curia was eager to give them release from Rome. They were fighting a losing battle against all the depression of the

¹ *Civiltà*, VII., xi., 424-5.

season, of their state of health, and of their age. The southerners, on the other hand, had the double advantage of being on the winning side and more at home with the climate. At length, on the 2nd of July, the weary wheels seemed as if they would go no longer. The list of speakers still inscribed threatened very considerable detention. Hefele had entered his name among the earliest, and when he applied for his turn found he was somewhere in 'the fifties,' and when he next applied, that he was in 'the seventies.' Had the minority foreseen what was hidden behind clouds, but ready to thunder forth, they would perhaps have kept the debate open; and so the Papacy would have been saved from the last fatal step. Just now, by a strange coincidence, appeared in the *Civiltá* the tale describing the march of the newly landed French troops for Mentana in 1867, with their sisters of mercy. 'O France!' cried the literary crusader, 'may the angels of God who to a field of just but terrible vengeance accompanied that host, warring only for celestial charity, evermore protect the land of generous hearts.'¹ But, not knowing what was so near at hand, the minority at last reached the point at which men are ready to say, We are fighting in vain, and therefore fighting without justification. They agreed among themselves that they might as well give up their right to speak, and let matters be brought to a crisis. On the 4th of July, when the Council met, Schwarzenberg and others gave up their right. The formidable name of Darboy was called. No Darboy was there. So that instead of a final argument in opposition, there was his conspicuous example in favour of withdrawing. For a long time every one who had done so had received marks of approbation both from the Council and from the Presidents, and every expedient had been used to induce men to abridge the discussion. It was soon apparent that the leaders of the Opposition had adopted a common policy. One after another waived his right. A couple of inconsiderable men claimed their turn, but said

¹ VII., xi., 37.

little. The bulk of the men on both sides entered into the general movement, and to the relief of all, and the delight of the triumphant majority, Cardinal De Luca announced that the list of the speakers was exhausted, and that the debate was closed. So, as early as halfpast nine o'clock, people saw the Fathers gliding down the cathedral and dispersing over the city. They wondered what had released them so early, and, as Vitelleschi says, little realised the importance of their decisions, either to the Church or to the world.

Dated on the very day on which the discussion closed, the *Civiltà* issued an article on the Decline of Liberalism, which shows how the political aspects of the legislation, now nearly completed, were kept in view.¹ A Catholic gale, says the writer, seems to be passing over the world, vivifying and gladdening society, corrupted and worm-eaten by Liberalism.

A single people, the Roman, finds itself, by the special providence of God, free from this universal Liberal domination ; and this Roman people alone, still happily governed according to the laws of God, in contradiction to the great principles of modern society, enjoys the sweet fruits of true progress, and is the object of admiration and envy ; for of it alone can it be said, Happy is the people whose God is the Lord. As a drunken slave used to be exhibited to the Spartans to inspire them with hatred of intemperance, so Providence in almost every part of Europe has allowed slaves drunk and mad with Liberalism, slaves of tyrants sprung out of the dung-hill, to be exhibited till Europe, now weary of Liberalism, could only look to Rome and to her civil and religious head, not merely the sole guardian and faithful depositary, but the infallible herald of the principles of universal religion and truth, civilisation and prosperity, even natural and social, among nations as well as among individuals. We may say that from the first stage of the movement to the last, it is nations and not individuals that are kept in view.

¹ *Civiltà*, VII., xi., p. 129.

In Bavaria, Belgium, and Portugal, the writer asserts, the Catholics are escaping from the trammels of the Masons. In Austria the same process is in preparation. In France they are more resolved than ever to sustain Rome. In Italy Liberalism is exhausted, despised, divided, and falling. ‘Even in Protestant and heterodox countries, Rome, with her civil and religious prince, stands in much higher credit than Italy and other Liberal governments apparently stronger.’

Sneering at an allusion of the *Journal des Débats* to the vaunted hopes of the Catholics, accompanied by the remark that in spite of their absurdity it was nevertheless prudent to keep an eye on the clock which was to sound the return of the hour for great things, the *Civilità* says it will not deny that Liberalism has some ‘bad quarters of an hour’ before it. It equally thinks that now it is neither imprudent nor rash ‘to hope, and that within a time not remote, for the victory of Rome and its Pontiff-king, so far as Italy is concerned, and for the victory of the social, civil, and religious principles which that king represents and proclaims.’

The triumph over intellect it holds to be patent and ascertained, and therefore this hope of a triumph in facts is reasonable.

Providence, continues the soothsayer, cannot permit the Church to be long the victim of the devices of the gates of hell, particularly of those devices with which the States of the Church are now beset. After making allusion to hopes which had been entertained of the Pope’s death, and asserting his florid health and his prospect of living many years, he proceeds: ‘The Pontiff lives and reigns in Rome more secure, more glorious, more influential, more beloved than his enemies.’ Not only is the fact that this potentate was defended by the arms of France entirely absent from the consciousness of the writer, but he indulges in jibes clearly addressed to the very Emperor who had restored the Pontiff and kept him up. ‘Sound Catholic principles now seem to politicians the only

support of material order and of economical interests.' The writer goes on to show that all the implements of Liberalism have been employed on behalf of the Papacy, and that with success—meetings, addresses, collections, votes, illuminations. He here omits, as probably too obvious, what in such boasting is generally made very prominent, the press and schools.

Writing with an expectation that before its words came under the eye of his readers (p. 174) they would have already learned that the great word had been spoken, and that Papal infallibility had taken its place among revealed truths, the writer proceeds to indicate the range of the new attribute:—

'The Roman Pontiff is the Vicar of Christ. Therefore is he the continuator of the work of Christ in the world. He, standing in His stead, is the witness to the truth in the midst of us. Christ is the voice of the Father, and the Pontiff is the voice of Christ. The Father, in the fulness of time, spake unto us by His Son. The Son, after His return to the Father, continues to speak to us by His Vicar. Now, is it conceivable that a lie can ever be found in such a mouth, in such a word?—and if it could be found, would not the mission of Christ and the duration of His reign have vanished *ipso facto*? Affirming the infallibility of the Pontiff, therefore, means no less than affirming the duration of the reign of Christ upon earth.'

Many who, on beginning to read this work, would have shrunk from interpreting language as to the Kingdom of Christ or the reign of Christ in the Jesuit sense, will by this time be prepared to see how a fallen faith which in effect brings down our Lord to the level of the Pope, must impress itself on the language of those who hold it. Any thoughtful man who will spend a few minutes in calmly setting out before his mind the ideas here shown to rule the mind of a Jesuit, will ever after attach a more definite meaning to the language of Ultramontanes when they speak of the Word of God, the Kingdom of God, the Christian civil system, or use any other terms, affecting the relative positions of the Pope and of the rest of the human race.

The writer of this article gratefully recognises the surpassing zeal of France and her title to the first place among nations

devoted to the Church. Those who form exceptions to the general devotion of France do not belong to her. The Opposition in the Council are called the new Arians, a clear analogy being discerned between denying to our Lord His divinity and denying to the Pope his place as the infallible representative of the Lord. The dogma, continues the *Civiltá*, would now come forth with the double advantage of an acclamation and a discussion. The famous petition for the definition, by a vast majority of the bishops, was indeed an acclamation, and to this had been added an ample discussion. It asserts that there never had been in the history of the world so full and exhaustive an examination of any question. The writer is unconscious of the fact that before changing a principle of law, or even a fiscal arrangement like a duty on corn, we slow English sometimes employ as many years as they had employed months in settling the source of all principles for ever. Not only so, but with us each new thread shot into the progressive web of the discussion is laid bare to every eye and to every magnifying glass that nature and art can lend. The *Civiltá* puts in even the word 'ventilated' among the epithets denoting the unparalleled winnowing of this great question. Why, the *Civiltá* itself, during the progress of the discussion, readily told, indeed, who celebrated mass, who died, who received a title, a distinction, or a place, who got leave to stay away; but it did not even tell who spoke, much less anything about what was said. It gave not a word of information to the whole Catholic Church of what was proposed to be done with its creed, or of what the assembled bishops thought of the proposal. 'Ventilation,' which, in the esteem of the *Civiltá* sufficed to winnow the chaff from the wheat in a question affecting the bread of the world, would in the view of others amount to shutting up the whole in the dank air of the tomb of St. Peter. In the very same volume where these fine words are written, we have this specimen of the *Civiltá's* history, with which we connect one

from Monsignor Guérin, as showing what free air will blow around the chairs of history in our colleges and around the tables of our editors when once dogma has achieved its Sedan (VII., xi., 237). ‘Our readers will be gratified’—a blundering English journalist would have commenced such a paragraph with apologies for not being able to tell his readers anything worth knowing, but the accomplished Jesuit begins with congratulating them on the amount of information he is about to give—‘Our readers will be gratified to have under their eyes a view of how many spoke, or gave up the right of speaking, in the discussion on the 4th chapter,’—that is, on the great chapter containing the express statement of infallibility.

15 June, 1 Reporter and 2 Speakers.

18 June, 3 Speakers.

20 June, 1 Reporter and 4 Speakers.

22 June, 7 Speakers.

23 June, 5 Speakers.

25 June, 6 Speakers and 2 gave up their right.

28 June, 6 Speakers.

30 June, 6 Speakers and 2 gave up their right.

1 July, 6 Speakers.

2 July, 9 Speakers and 14 gave up their right.

4 July, 2 Speakers and 42 gave up their right.

The excellent Monsignor says (p. 113),—and it is for thoughtful men to spend a little time in forming a clear idea of what would be the condition of the world if its information on its supreme affairs was supplied in this fashion :—

There were General Congregations on the 8th of January, the 10th, the 14th, the 15th, the 18th, the 19th, the 21st, the 22nd, the 24th, the 25th, the 27th, the 31st, on the 3rd of February, the 4th, the 7th, the 8th, the 10th, the 14th, the 15th, the 18th, the 21st, the 22nd. An interruption of the General Congregations for a month ; a resumption of the Congregation on the 18th of March (thirtieth Congregation), the 22nd, the 23rd, the 25th, the 26th, the 28th, the 29th, the 30th, the 31st, the 1st of April, the 4th, the 5th, the 6th, the 7th, the 8th, the 12th, the 19th.

We do not know why this instructive method of writing the

most important of histories, that of the process of making laws for the whole world, is not continued through and through. Vestments and processions, bulls or Papal briefs, are not in the same manner hidden behind Arabic numerals. Any one may, at the British Museum, feast his own eyes on a specimen of such luminous history. The seventh volume of *Frond* is the History of the Council. The student will find it a folio in sumptuous Morocco, with gilt edges, and paper thicker than vellum. He will find it faultless and very full in matters of rank, precedence, forms and ceremonies; each cope and favour, each lappet, and each heave of the censer is well and duly noted. But as to questions respecting what men thought, said, proposed, deprecated, or took delight in, the poor student may open three leaves in succession and find both sides filled with mere numerals, names, and titles.¹ One grave historical error is confessed in the corrigenda. On a certain occasion even the pen guided by the ‘radiance of infallibility’ slipped so far as to say that their Eminences the Cardinals were to be in black stockings. The correction shows that ‘black slippers’ were the proper words.

It would for a time have seemed as if the glories once foretold to follow the dogma had considerably faded from the eyes of the seers during the wearying months of debate. Now, however, that the goal was in sight, the vistas reopened, and if translucent clouds rendered the distant view indistinct, they greatly enhanced its splendour. Still there was no weak expectation that the great results would be instantly attained. As centuries were required to bring the Anti-Papal movement in society to the present pass, so was it calculated that centuries would be required to bring the counter-movement to its full development.

‘It is not to be believed that an event so glorious, and one brought about by God with dispensations so singular, is to remain confined within itself. It will be prolific of prodigious effects in every social sphere for the salvation of the *nations*. God does not work by accident, or set in motion great means for small ends. We do not hesitate to affirm

¹ *E.g.*, pp. 224, 226, 228.

that just as the subversive negations of authority which prevailed at the Council of Basle indicated the principles of the great politico-religious revolution of modern times, so the reparative affirmation of all the privileges of the See of Peter now so solemnly made by the Vatican Council will indicate the principles of restoration in every public and private sphere of Christendom. Hence in the series of the centuries this of ours will be a day blest and magnified as that in which, thanks to the Council held under Pio Nono, the light again dawned on an oppressed world wrapped up in the darkness of the Revolution' (p. 178-9).

'Thanks then, benediction, and hymns of praise to the Giver of all good for such a benign dispensation. . . . In the midst of the armaments of her enemies preparing to give her battle, the Church has consolidated the command of her supreme Captain. She has lent a more efficacious value to his orders, and to him has she more closely bound the minor captains and the whole army of the faithful. Henceforth it can be said with greater truth that she is "terrible as an army set in array."¹

The writer does not overlook us non-Catholics. For us also the great event was pregnant with blessing, showing us, above all things, 'the divine organisation of the Church,' and in it showing us the 'remedy for the unbridled excesses of private judgment, the parent of that Babel confusion in which we are involved.' Therefore,

'to Mary, sweet Lady and Queen of this kingdom of Christ, be loving thanksgivings rendered, for after God to her favour do we trace the benefit obtained. Scarcely had we read in the Bull of Convocation that the Council would open its sittings on the day sacred to the Immaculate Conception of Mary, before we felt a firm and immovable hope of the definition of pontifical infallibility. It was fitting that the Pontiff who, amid the applause of the Christian world, had dogmatically asserted the highest prerogatives of her holiness, should himself behold the highest prerogatives of his apostolic ministry dogmatically affirmed' (p. 180).

¹ The Vulgate rendering of 'terrible as an army with banners.'

CHAPTER VII.

To the Eve of the Great Session, July 18th—A Fresh Shock for the Opposition—Serious Trick of the Presidents and Committee—Outcry of the French Bishops—Proposal to Quit the Council—They send in another Protest—What is Protestantism?—Immediate War not foreseen—Contested Canon adopted—The Bishops threatened—Hasty Proceedings—Final Vote on the Dogma—Unexpected Firmness of the Minority—Effect of the Vote—Deputation to the Pope—His incredible Prevarication—Ketteler's Scene—Counter Deputation of Manning and Senestrey—Vast Changes in the Decrees made in a Moment—Petty Condemnations—The Minority flies.

IT might have been thought that incidents of public interest had now terminated. On the very next day, however, after the close of the great discussion, occurred a collision which, had the Opposition been morally capable of saving anything, would have given it the opportunity of saving the Roman Catholic Church from falling into the condition of a body without any constitution, except the 'inner light' of one man. It opened their eyes, perhaps not more widely, but once more. It smote their feelings, excited a momentary effort at action, and ended in a protest drawn up by Bishop Dinkel.

We have already seen how the crown was put upon the Decree of Faith by a conclusion which the committee had not adopted, but which the Pope imposed, and the officials surreptitiously introduced. That conclusion linked to the action of God as Creator and Preserver of the world, every decree of a Pope as governor of the world. Now was to come another imposed formula, doing for the Decree on the Church what the conclusion had done for that on Faith. The conclusion had given to the Pope's legislative acts a place in the supernatural ordinances governing the world. The new Canon was to support this by making the Pope's authority the sole authority in the kingdom of God below, and therefore supreme over all authority that was merely of the natural kingdom.

One Sunday the Fathers were studying sixty-two amendments proposed on the second chapter of the great Decree. It seemed

awful work to decide so many points affecting the faith on a single Monday morning! But behold, in the evening come in one hundred and twenty-two amendments on the fourth chapter, to be voted upon on the Tuesday!

The procedure was on this wise. Amendments suggested, after being in the hands of the committee, were reported in print, and then put to the vote. The Sub-Secretary said, The committee oppose the amendment: let those who oppose it stand up. Or, The Committee accept the amendment: let those who accept it stand up. So by scores at a time were questions settled on which men had had no chance of reflecting. Only once, says *La Liberté du Concile*, did the Fathers succeed in obtaining from the Presidents a delay. It was on the very occasion just mentioned, when they showed that the only time permitted to them to read over the hundred and twenty-two amendments to be despatched on the Tuesday, would be what would be left of the Monday after they had despatched no less than sixty-two. They did obtain twenty-four hours' extension of the time. 'You are convoked on purpose to vote,' says the writer, who, be it remembered, printed only fifty copies, for Cardinals alone, 'and you have not time to study, not even to read it over again' (Doc. i., p. 175).

If ever an important act was passed by an assembly it was the Canon which closes the third chapter of the great Vatican Decree. Quirinus hardly exaggerates its importance when he speaks of it, if interpreted by the rules of Canon law, as handing over the bodies and souls of all men to one. On the 5th of July the Fathers had in print before them a formula for this Canon, and three proposed amendments. The Bishop of Rovigo, as reporter for the committee, broke all rule first by saying that amendments No. 70 and 71 should not be voted upon, as the committee had adopted No. 72, with a modification. It would appear that, utter as was the disregard here manifested even of the Pope's own Rules as well of the rights of the proposers of the amendments and of those of the Council, this

was allowed to pass. But soon even that broken-spirited Opposition was roused. It was plain to some that what the Bishop read as No. 72 was not what was in print as 72. The Presidents wanted to put what had been read, but then, according to the *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, arose Haynald and protested. Though the Council itself had no right to shape the amendments, the Rules required that all amendments should be put before it as they had been shaped by the committee, and it was for the Council to say Yea or Nay. Darboy also rose, and more fully entered his protest. The protest could not at the moment be brushed aside. Here was obviously a proposal differing from that of the committee, foisted in against all rule, and without notice. For once the prohibition against speaking to order had been defied. The Presidents, thrown into confusion, could not conceal the attempted trick; yet they durst not abandon the spurious Canon. They therefore said something about inadvertence, and withdrew it for the present, to be submitted to the committee, then to be printed and voted upon at another time.

The fact was that the difference between the two forms involved the whole question of jurisdiction between bishops and Pope. One form had been withdrawn by the committee, and an amendment had been accepted. The Pope was incensed. He ordered the third Canon to be altered back to the form which had been objected to, and even this was greatly strengthened. He never submitted the alteration to the committee, but sent it direct to the reporter to be then and there put to the vote instead of the Canon which stood on the printed Order of the Day. How great was the difference in the wording of what the Fathers had before them in print, and what was attempted to be palmed upon them, is obvious on reading the two:—

THE CANON AS IT WAS IN PRINT.

If any shall say that the Primacy
of the Roman Pontiff is only an

**THE CANON AS IT WAS READ AND
ATTEMPTED TO BE PUT TO THE
VOTE,**

If any one shall say that the
Roman Pontiff has only an office of

office of supervision and direction, and that his supreme jurisdiction over the universal Church is not plenary, but only extraordinary and mediate, let him be anathema,

supervision or direction, but not plenary and supreme power over the whole Church, both in things pertaining to faith and morals, and also in those pertaining to the discipline and government of the Church dispersed through all the earth, or that he has only the chief portion but not the entire fulness of this supreme power, or that this his power is not ordinary and immediate, whether over the Churches all and singular, or over pastors and believers all and singular, let him be anathema.

Meditation on what was involved in these claims to all-absorbing power was not likely to relieve the bishops of the pain caused by the stealthy attempt upon their vote. What the Presiding Cardinals and the Bishop of Rovigo had tried to steal from them, was not trash. It was all that ancient bishops, even when acknowledging the primacy of Rome, would have fought for with at least ecclesiastical weapons. Of the Committee not a man spoke his scorn, and the steady majority was not shaken. The world accused it of conspiring against the rights and liberties of mankind. It might full as well have been accused of conspiring against the rights and liberties of bishops. If the official organs had often, during the Council, used such language as 'lying' and so forth, they were quiet now, while words like 'lying,' 'cheating,' 'deceiving,' etc., flew freely about, and, if Quirinus be correct, were repeatedly used in the meetings of the bishops of the minority.

But if the majority was not disturbed, a note rang out from the French minority which might remind any one who has lived in their country through a revolution, of the *Prend ton sac*—Take thy sack!—the three sudden taps which at such a time make timid hearts in a house beat as if they had been hit by the drumstick.

'1. The hour of Providence has struck,' cries this voice, with the true

French ring. ‘The decisive moment for saving the Church has arrived. 2. By the additions made to the third Canon of the third chapter, the committee, *de fide*, has violated the Rules, which permit not the introduction of any amendment without discussion by the Council. 3. The addition surreptitiously made is of importance beyond calculation. It changes the constitution of the Church. It enacts the monarchy of the Pope pure, absolute, and indivisible. It carries the abolition of the judicial rights and the co-sovereignty of the bishops, and with it the affirmation and anticipatory definition of separate and personal infallibility. 4. Duty and honour permit us not to vote this Canon without discussion, as it contains an immense revolution. The discussion can and may last six months, for it affects the capital question, the very constitution of the sovereign power in the Church. 5. This discussion is impossible, because of the pressure of the season and the disposition of the majority. 6. One thing alone, worthy and honourable, remains to be done—to demand the immediate prorogation of the Council till the month of October, and to present a declaration, in which all the protests already sent in shall be enumerated, and the last violation of the Rules shall be set forth, as well as the contempt shown to the dignity and liberty of the bishops. At the same time, we must give notice of our intended departure, which can no longer be deferred. 7. By the departure, on such grounds, of a considerable number of bishops of all nations, the ecumenicity of the Council would be at an end, and all acts which it might subsequently adopt would be null in point of authority. 8. The courage and devotedness of the minority would produce an immense effect in the world. The Council would meet in the month of October in circumstances vastly more favourable. All the questions now only broached would be taken up again and treated with dignity and liberty. The Church would be saved, and the moral order of the world.’¹

Had this energetic advice been adopted, the Roman Catholic Church would for the time have been saved from the last step in a downward series; but whether the moral order of the world would have been the better is another question. It was a favourite principle with the heralds of the new era, that the combat it would provoke was altogether necessary, and would be profitable, because light and darkness would be divided, which was indispensable to an honest struggle. Those who seek a moral order higher than could be given by the men who attempted to palm the new Canon upon the Council, may well be content to have the lines drawn and the

¹ Friedberg, 145; Quirinus, 788.

forces defined. The Council has given to all men an opportunity of knowing, if they will, what are the morals of the Pope and his officers, and what is order in their vocabulary. Any who expect peace under their order may accept that order. All who, instead of peace, expect only repression alternating with convulsion, will set their faces against it. The moral order of the world must now be secured either under the absolute dominion of the Pontiff, or, as it has been best secured before, over the remains of his pretensions.

But the bishops of the minority were not the men to give the Church a further chance of continuing that confusion of all moral order which resulted from her old ambiguities. They did now as they had done before—let her take her way, and sent in a protest stating the main facts of the deception and breach of Rules.¹ One can almost see the smiles of the men in power at the sight of one piece of paper more.

If ever there was a case to justify the hasty saying ascribed to Burke, that Protestantism is a mere negation, it was that of the Vatican minority always protesting and never maintaining its ground. Of course, every protest has its negative side, but that is the side turned towards him who is protested against. It always has its positive side; that is, the side of him who makes the protest. He asserts a right, and sets himself to maintain it against an alleged invasion. He may certainly fail to maintain his position, and that either from want of ground to stand upon, or from want of strength to hold it. In either of these cases, and in these alone, does his protest turn to a mere negation. Dr. Newman, in a moment of sound sense, said, ‘What is the very meaning of the word “Protestantism,” but that there is a call to speak out?’² Had Oliver Goldsmith taken the seat for Bristol, in the House of Commons,

¹ See Protest with signatures, *Doc.*, II., 400-403.

² *Apologia*, p. 327.

which belonged to Edmund Burke, the latter would have found that he had a call to speak out, or would have protested, and the negative result would have been to Oliver, Turned out; but the positive one to Edmund, Seated. So, when in a day of mercy, nations, hearing from heaven a call to speak out, protested against the sins and follies of the Pontiff, their protest was indeed a mere negation to him whose pretensions were rolled back; but to those who made the protest good, it was a positive upholding of existing rights, a positive recovery of lapsed rights, a positive deliverance from great evils, and a positive entrance into possession of great and heritable good. They protested against the doctrinal authority of the Pontiff, and maintained the doctrinal authority of the Bible. The negation was for the Pontiff, the positive results were for the Bible, for themselves and for their children. They protested against the authority of ecclesiastical courts or Councils to fetter the press, the pulpit, or the private conscience. In doing so, they maintained a duty imposed, and a right given, by God, and they had not only the ground under them, but also strength to hold it. The negative result was to the Inquisition and the Curia. The positive result was to the Press, the Pulpit, the Civil Court, and the silent tribunal of the Soul, with its reinstated jury of accusing and excusing thoughts. They protested against indulgences, purgatory, and all the commerce of the mass, and maintained the free gift of God's unpurchaseable grace, the sovereignty of His judgment, the finished and all-perfect sacrifice of His Son. The negative result was to the Pontifical Exchequer. The positive result was to the substance and form of Christianity all over the world, to Churches destined to grow purer and more fruitful, to nations destined to wax strong. They protested against sensuous and idolatrous spectacle, and upheld scriptural worship; protested against colours, scents, and gorgeous dress, and upheld sound teaching, borrowing all its glory from spiritual elements, none from physical; they protested against priestly caste, and upheld a brotherhood, a

royal nation of priests; they protested against progressive conformity to newly-invented superstitions, against the service of local and subordinate divinities, and at the same time upheld progressive conformity to the standard of our Lord and His apostles. They protested against the political notion of union,—the subservience of all to one human head,—and upheld the divine ideal of oneness in one object of worship, one intercessor between God and man, one rule of faith, one way of salvation, one Refuge for prayer, one Deliverer for whom were all thanksgiving and all praise. They protested against the idea of one fold or one pen, but upheld that of one flock diversified in its members, various in its folds, but one in love to the common Lord and in likeness to the common Father.

When Darboy and Dupanloup, on the 4th of July, gave up the attempt of averting the definition by delay, how little did they know that a couple of days later and the whole prospect of the Papacy would be changed. When the Pope on the morrow of that day followed up his victory by the additional blow which the surreptitious Canon dealt at the very semblance of liberty or rule in the Council, how little did he suspect that the visions of restoration long floating before his fancy were to give place to real scenes of fresh disaster. It was only on the 10th of June that Ollivier, in the Chamber of Deputies, gave confident assurances of peace, while on the 6th of July, in the same Chamber, Gramont sounded an unmistakable blast of war. Even now, human foresight did not measure the rapidity with which events were to rush to a collision, and then to a catastrophe. Napoleon III. had so often seemed bent on measuring himself with Prussia, and had so often drawn back, that it was not unreasonable to hope that, even after bellicose words, he might be prudent once more.

The week following that day which placed in hazard the fortune of the restorer of the Papacy and those of the Papacy itself, was spent in the Council in voting the chapters in their final shape. The Canon which had been brought surreptitiously

forward on the fifth was produced in the regular manner on the thirteenth, and after all the outcry it was passed ; ‘the most pregnant article,’ says Quirinus, ‘that had been laid before any Council for six hundred years.’ It was now voted by rising and sitting,—which is not to be wondered at when originally the Presidents had wanted it to be voted without being even known. We must not blame the minority for not now debating it. The Rules did not allow of this. It had been adopted by the committee and must be met with a Yea or Nay. How many voted against this pregnant act is uncertain. Some say fifty or sixty, some ninety or a hundred.¹ In that act every shred and tatter of the Gallican liberties, or any other liberties, except that of doing the Pope’s will, passed from the Papal officers, whom, as Quirinus says, the Roman Chancery still calls bishops. The chapter to which this Canon was attached annulled all national rights whatever, whether Gallican, Josephine, or parliamentary, which might conflict with the supreme authority. Vitelleschi (p. 202) says that the Secretary of State appeared very uneasy as to the opinion of governments on this fresh declaration. How would they receive the Pope’s new vicars, who would no longer represent a national authority or a local interest, but would represent only the authority of a foreign prince with a policy of his own,—a prince to whom these prefects would owe an obedience sacred above and against all national ties and obligations ? Daru had made the Secretary of State feel that some politicians, at least, took the trouble of looking below the folds of priestly silk and lace, to see what was the actual substance of polity which all those gay and perplexing envelopes covered. He was no longer so confident of escaping but half understood. The bishops naturally would have similar apprehensions, but as to them, fear cast out fear. They had good reason to believe in the gentleness of Liberal

¹ *Quirinus*, p. 792. The *Acta Sanctæ Sedis* does not think it worth while to count;—‘fifty or thereabouts,’ ‘quinquaginta circiter patribus dissentientibus’ (vi., p. 31).

governments, and they had no reason to believe in the gentleness of the Pope. They trusted, says Vitelleschi, to the tolerance and freedom of thought which has everywhere triumphed in modern days,—a freedom which their party never ceases to oppose, but which it knows how to turn to its own purpose better than even the Liberals (p. 203). With the Papal government, on the other hand, they had neither tolerance nor freedom to trust to. They knew that if they dared to provoke it, the stroke of Pius IX. would come down hot and heavy. The oath of a bishop to the Pope, which obviously aims more at feudal vassalage than at spiritual works, had, as we have already intimated, made the Emperor Joseph II. feel that men bound by it were not citizens in the sense of free men. ‘It does not accord with the fidelity or obedience due by a bishop, as a subject, to his sovereign. . . . A bishop who feels himself bound by that oath must become perjured.’¹ Speaking of attempts to reform the Church, he says, ‘As to bishops, one cannot hope for any good from them, on account of their oath.’

Many writers mention what is clearly stated in a letter of Hefele, under date of the 9th of July² :—

‘The intention of the Pope is, in spite of the minority, to proceed at once to the publication of the new dogma, and forthwith to hand to every bishop two documents for his signature: (1) A profession of faith containing the article of infallibility; (2) A solemn declaration that the Council has been a free one. So you see into what a position we are brought, and that it does not depend on our own will whether we shall remain in our places or not. He that will not sign will instantly be placed under censure.’

According to Vitelleschi, this threat terrified the poor bishops of the Opposition. If they refused to acknowledge the validity of the Council, nothing, as he says, was before them but to resign their Sees. If they meant to impugn the validity of the Council, Rome was not the place in which to do it, and, what is still more significant, they themselves ‘were not the men to do it.’

¹ *Le Con. du Vat. et le Mouvement Anti-Infaillibiliste*, pp. 6-10.

² *Friedrich*, p. 405.

It proved on the next day that the candidature of a Hohenzollern prince for the vacant crown of Spain, which had given to France the occasion for a quarrel, had been withdrawn. But it also appeared that Lord Lyons had to reproach the Duke De Gramont with a breach of promise, inasmuch as the Duke had authorised him to assure her Majesty's government that if the withdrawal of the prince could only be procured the affair would be at an end. It was plain that the long-prophesied attack of France was resolved upon at last. What with the impatience of the majority for the fruits of their victory and the disgust and discouragement of the minority, the sufferings from the heat and the solicitude occasioned by approaching war, the assembly had ceased to be, in any serious sense of the word, deliberative. Amendments literally by the score were now produced and disposed of with a haste which was in shocking contrast with the gravity of the subjects. *La Liberté du Concile* says that on the all-important chapters on faith there were proposed two hundred and eighty-one amendments. The Fathers were called on to vote them by standing and sitting, and this was done in such haste that they had not even time to re-read them. The Under-Secretary did not read them out. He cried, 'Number ten, number fifty, or number seventy-seven,' as the case might be, 'the committee rejects: those who are in favour of its rejection stand up.' The solid majority stood up, and all was over. So in another case he cried out, 'Number five or fifteen,' adding 'The committee accepts: those who are in favour of accepting stand up;' and the same result. 'I do not vote,' said one bishop, 'because not only am I unable to form a conviction, but I am unable even to form a clear idea of what is the point' (*Documenta*, i., 174). And each minutest point was to be irreformably fixed! We had, says this writer, four hundred quarto pages on the subject of infallibility, including notes, remarks, and all, while only a few days were allowed to study it. So when the Draft Decrees on Faith were for the second time brought out new cast, with a preamble, four

chapters, and eighteen canons, twenty-four hours were allowed to prepare to discuss them ; and the preparation must be in Latin. Twenty-four hours for an accountable creature of God to prepare himself to say whether he would take a side for or against laying upon himself the obligation to pronounce eighteen curses more against his fellow creatures !

The hope had been flattered all along that no anathema would be attached to the dogma of infallibility. But at the very last Bishop Gasser, of Brixen, one of the keen Curialists, produced the formula enriched with an anathema against any one who should presume to contradict it. Quirinus says that Gasser was unwilling to be left behind by Manning, Deschamps, Dreux-Brézé, and the Spaniards. Finally the whole was submitted to the solemn decision on that very day on which the French Chamber, that had so long voted money for the forces to support the Papacy in Rome, voted five hundred and fifteen millions of francs to break up united Germany once more.

On the morning of July 13th the hour had come. Up to the last it had been asserted that no bishops but two or three would say *Non placet*. Every form of assurance had been spoken and printed that this would prove to be the case. The Virgin, the Saints, ay, and even the Holy Spirit, had been over and over again pledged to procure this result. At last, Ketteler and Landriot of Rheims made a clever attempt to bring it about by proposing to the Opposition, with which they had seemed to be at one, that they should all vote *Placet juxta modum* (content on certain conditions).¹ This would have enabled the Court to say that there were no votes of 'non-content.' The Archbishop of Milan said, 'The only befitting course for us who are convinced of the falsehood of the doctrine is to say, No.'² The Pope, it is said, told Darboy that not above ten would vote *Non placet*.³ Certain it is that bets would have been freely taken in Rome the night before that not a dozen would do so. The devout were confident because the Virgin would order it other-

¹ *Quirinus*, p. 771.

² *Ibid.*, p. 772.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 773.

wise, and the worldly were confident because they thought the bishops would not be unmindful of their own interests.

The Hall once more received its aged senators. Eighteen centuries called to them to remember what a Church Christ had set up; how pure in principle, how free in regulations, how plain in forms, how simple in organisation, how far from pomp or dreams of domination, from cursing, or from use of physical force; how little of a body, how much of a spirit, was that real Church. It was a leaven moving by the force of an inward and self-propagating life to leaven the whole lump, in which for itself it only asked to lie hidden, and by its innate force to determine the quality of the meal, not stooping to design a mould for the shape of the loaves, on a model as irreformable as the patterns of a Hindu artisan. Many bishops had said that they had found themselves called together to gratify one self-asserting man of ordinary gifts, and less than ordinary acquirements, by giving him a diploma as the titular Lord of the world, which would have no practical effect except that of making him dictator of the Church, and bringing them and their people into collision with everything bright and noble, which he, in his infatuation, had set himself to put down. Many of them, at considerable risk to their own interests, were determined to register their solemn No! In spite of all hopes previously entertained, the feeling that the minority were resolved had spread among the majority. Quirinus tells how Deschamps, who had drafted a set of supererogatory anathemas, and had only withdrawn them in face of serious threats from Maret, and who was therefore known as having sought to place every man of the minority in the dilemma between giving an instant affirmative vote, or being immediately outside the Church by anathema, now approached the leaders of the Opposition. 'With humble gestures and whining voice,' he entreated them to do as Ketteler and Landriot, professedly belonging to them, had proposed, namely, to vote 'Content on certain conditions,' and said that really there was a disposition on the part of the

authorities to insert qualifications. ‘The trick was too bare-faced to succeed.’ Darboy called the attention of the three Cardinals to this attempt to divide the Opposition at the last, and the bishops said to the new Primate of Belgium, on whose head the gifted already saw the mitre kindling into the flame-colour of a hat, ‘It is unexampled impudence.’ We shall find hereafter, in the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, what would appear to be an allusion to this scene.

The voting then began. It appeared that there were six hundred and one bishops present, showing that many of those who were in the city had stayed away. Antonelli was not there. Of course all the men belonging to Rome and the patrimony of St. Peter were for the Pope. So were nearly all those of the Neapolitan States, and the overwhelming majority from the other portions of Italy; Spain, South America, and the missionary bishops, might be said to be as one man. But to the surprise of every one, several of the Orientals, under the Propaganda as they were, and terrorised as they had been, had the heart to say No. Even poor old Audu, Patriarch of Chaldea, dared to say *Non placet*, knowing, from his experience by night in the Vatican, to what he might be exposed. Of course Ballerini and Valerga, and other Romans, whose Orientalism went no deeper than their vestments, were Roman still. When the important preliminary votes had been taken by rising and sitting, the Sub-Secretary ascended the pulpit. He called out name after name, each one replying by the words, *Placet*, *Non placet*, or *Placet juxta modum*; that is, Content, Not Content, or Conditionally Content. The vast majority said *Placet*; but the stateliest of Cardinals, Prince Schwarzenberg, said No. Milan said No; Paris, No; Munich, No; Vienna, No; Gran, the Primatial See of Hungary, No; Lyons, the Primatial See of France, No. In all, no less than eighty-eight living witnesses that day lifted up their testimony, and sent it on to all after-time, that, so far as they knew, the doctrine of Papal infallibility had not been, and was not then, the faith

of the Churches which they represented. Nearly all these did represent Churches, many of them the oldest, the most educated, and the most numerous in the Papal world. Maret, who was a bishop *in partibus*, being among the minority, was like a bird in the wrong flock.

Strange to say, no less than seven Cardinals then present in Rome abstained from voting. The abstentions altogether numbered eighty. Poor Cardinal Guidi, who had been sadly belaboured for his fault, had been forbidden to receive visitors, and had been made miserable by all the arts which priests can practise, and to which priests are exposed, now voted *Juxta modum*; that is, conditionally content. The number who did the same were sixty-two. A false impression was spread among the Liberal Catholics, that these were all adverse to the definition. Not so. Some of them did not think the formula now before them strong enough, and had notable additions to propose. The Contents were, 451; the Non-contents, 88; and the Conditional Contents, 62.¹ The *Acta* of the Council contain not a syllable of this sitting, any more than of all the others of the General Congregations.

The effect of this vote in Rome was immense. No class of men had counted upon it. Even ardent supporters of the minority had shown a want of any confidence that they would stand fast up to this point. The impression got abroad, for the moment, that not even Pius IX., little delicate as he was, would accept an apotheosis, as it was called, which had been publicly discredited by nearly all the bishops of great Sees, who were in any sense independent of the Bishop of Rome. 'According to general belief, especially in Rome,' says Vitelleschi (p. 206), 'the Church never creates a dogma new in itself; but in defining a dogma, simply attests some belief which has been always and universally professed.' The Romans saw that both the 'always' and the 'universally' were for ever disproved by the vote. They knew how speedily black could

¹ *Civiltà*, VII., xi., 362. *Acta Sanctae Sedis* has the same numbers.

be made white, but they did not see how the device could this time succeed. There was the vote, saying what had been the belief of the bishops up to that hour. But probably the Romans soon corrected their first impression, by their habitual estimate of Pius IX. They never accuse him of pride, although they always accuse him of vanity and vainglory. A case in which the common voice so sharply draws the distinction is exceedingly rare in public life. He is not above accepting anything that is agreeable. Quirinus will have it that he still declared that the vote of the Opposition would be reversed, and that these misguided men would be so enlightened by the Holy Spirit, that they would publicly vote for the right.

From Munich a telegram was sent to Hefele bearing many names, among them that of Reithmayer, announcing universal 'joyful sensation' at the vote, and calling for 'immovable perseverance,' otherwise 'incalculable mischief.'¹

Nothing further now remained but the great solemnity for promulgating the Decree, and gathering the fruits of nearly eight months' toil. Only five days' delay was taken,—days of intense excitement, and of incidents striking at the time, and important for all time. The minority saw how their hopes that the Pope would recoil before a vote so solemn as that recorded had been vain. The war-horse was prancing outside the door of the Council, and the fighting sons of Loyola could already tell what tidings he would bring. Louis Napoleon might have doubts, but the Fathers of the *Cirilita* had none. 'Everything is always directed and turned by Providence for the good and the triumph of the Church' (VII., xi., 379). The crisis, they knew, would give the Vicar of God an opportunity of intervening, with his newly certified authority and infallibility, as mediator. This office once accepted, would easily be turned to that of supreme judge. So would his new reign be grandly commenced. The *Monde*, of Paris, said to be the organ of the Nuncio, already called the war a religious war against Pro-

¹ *Friedrich*, 406.

testantism. France had been assured in every form that she had only to attack Prussia, and all the Catholics of Southern Germany would join her. Without the miscalculation at the Tuilleries caused by these statements, it is not probable that the French would have been hurled into the ditch of Sedan. Both the precepts and the prophecies of the reconstructionists failed. The cry, ‘The Church,’ raised by the Bavarian priests, was not so strong as that of ‘The Fatherland,’ raised by the patriots. This fact was still unknown at the Vatican. Though the inflation manifest before the Council was somewhat reduced, too much remained. Hopes of a prosperous war and a good result were not unreasonable, and after victories who would think of the handful of bishops who had been simple enough to vote Non-content?

The prospect was not so bright to the bishops. They had not been always cooped up within the walls of Rome. Hints of how thoughts were turning reached them from home. They knew that men of study and of wisdom were either hostile to the new Constitution, or painfully solicitous. Some of the bishops had deep personal convictions, which experience during the Council had intensified ; convictions that the whole proceeding was neither more nor less than the adoption of a false doctrine to sanction a fatal policy, and that the error was so fundamental as to involve the acceptance of a purely human fountain of doctrine for all time to come. They met and debated whether they should vote in the open session. Only twenty, according to Archbishop Scherr, were in favour of this course, and these did not insist on their own views, lest they should divide the eighty-eight.

On the evening of the 15th of July, about eight o’clock, a deputation entered the Vatican, composed of the Primate of France and Hungary, with the Archbishops of Paris and Munich, and the Bishops of Mainz and Dijon. They had to wait an hour,—a time doubtless filled up with meditations more ecclesiastical than those which sometimes occupy the moments

lost in the ante-rooms of the Vatican ; rooms full of traditional tales of the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and the sinful lusts of the flesh ; such tales as good men, who had been forced to hear them, would not easily be forced to repeat.¹

They were admitted about nine o'clock. They came from the minority to urge that the Pope should withdraw the additions made to the third canon of the third chapter, that canon the attempt to snatch an unconscious vote upon which had caused so profound an impression. They also wished the addition of a limiting clause to the definition of infallibility in the fourth chapter. Quirinus seems afraid to report the answer given by the Pope, and that for a reason which we suspect has often prevented English correspondents writing in Italy from telling true tales. They know that we judge of Popes and Cardinals by some such standard as that of our own public men, and that therefore to us the true tale would look like an invention. In the present case the answer was, 'I shall do all I can, my dear sons; but I have not yet read the proposed Decree, and I do not know what it contains.'² His Holiness requested

¹ When, in 1860, writing *Italy in Transition*, I read, on the recommendation of an Italian gentleman, a book by a well-known writer professing to describe the interior life of the Vatican; but found it too low to allow me even to allude to it, much less to quote it. What was my surprise when, a year or so later, appeared the work of Liverani, to find this very book—which even now I do not care to name—cited with that of About and of others, as a work the *substantial* accuracy of which the learned Domestic Prelate and Protonotary of the Holy See could not deny.

² *Quirinus*, p. 801. This astounding assertion does not rest upon the sole authority of Quirinus. Friedrich, in reporting the sayings of the Archbishop of Munich to the Faculty of Theology in that city on his return, gives the same assertion as repeated by his Grace. It had been a favourite theory with official writers that Quirinus was Friedrich, but as the latter left Rome in May, and Quirinus continued to write to the last, that theory had dropped out of sight. It is a curious coincidence in the present case that nearly all the incidents of this interview mentioned by Quirinus writing in Rome on the 19th of July, were repeated by Archbishop Scherr in Munich to the Faculty two days later. The substantial agreement of the two accounts is quite as great as that in several other cases which have induced men like Hergenröther to argue that Friedrich and Quirinus were one. The agreement is such as would be found between two practised writers hearing an account from the same eyewitness, or from two or three eyewitnesses, and immediately writing down what they had heard. *Friedrich*, p. 408 ff.

to have the petition in writing. The spokesman, Darboy, replied, with French tact, that he would have it sent to his Holiness, and would take the liberty of forwarding at the same time the proposed Decree, which the Commission and the Presiding Cardinals had omitted to lay before his Holiness, though it wanted only two days of the public session, and thus had exposed him to the danger of promulgating a Decree of which he was ignorant. Darboy not only did this, but also took care that others should know what the Pope had actually said. He wrote to the Committee on Faith, strongly censuring them for their neglect in not laying the proposed Decrees before the Pontiff!

We have before spoken of tokens of indifference to religious convictions, but if previous ones were monstrous this one was inconceivable. The excuse which the Pope selected shows that the man could have had no idea whatever of the effect that it would have upon all to whom submission in matters of religion means conviction, and conviction means searching whether these things are so, and examination means a sense of accountability to God and man.

It is curious to observe how all the Liberal Catholic writers who had come to Rome began by speaking of the Pope with the deference usual on this side of the Alps, but finally slipped into the habit of calling him 'Pius.' They evidently often had difficulty between their sense of the conventional respect due to a personage whom so many own as their head, and their feelings as honest men. The latter would have often prompted them to speak of Pius IX. as Italians do, and not as Englishmen or Germans are wont to do.¹

¹ An instance of the effect of perfect knowledge of Rome by personal residence, on the style of expression and description, may be seen in Mr. T. A. Trollope's interesting book, *The Papal Conclaves*, as compared with the unreal and conventional forms kept up by Englishmen who know neither the language nor the spirit of the people. Some of the latter, ever since the days of the *Tracts for the Times*, provoke smiles, and have gradually been acquiring for our country a reputation very unlike the old reputation of England for strong common sense, love of reality, and contempt for shows and fables.

'Pius,' continues Quirinus, added that if they would increase their eighty-eight votes to a hundred he would see what could be done. Only those who know the opinions entertained by that writer of the Pope's personal ignorance, and of his habit of speaking as if he knew everything, can appreciate the statement that his Holiness concluded by assuring the deputation that it was notorious that the whole Church had always taught the unconditional infallibility of the Popes.

Bishop Ketteler now threw himself on his knees before the Pontiff. For some time he remained in that position, entreating his sovereign to make some concession, and thus to restore peace and unity to the Church and to the Episcopate. This was the very scene to please one like Pius IX. And so the deputation left him with some hopes of concession,—'full of the best hopes,' said the Archbishop of Munich.¹

Two men speedily sought to undo any impression that might have been made. Many a Roman Catholic has, in imagination, hovered over that scene, returning again and again to watch the figures of the agents of the Committee on Faith as they glided into the presence-chamber. Such Catholics in their imaginings have scowled at, ay, have cursed Senestrey the pupil of the Jesuit College *Germanicum*, and Manning the pupil of Oxford, as the instruments of the Jesuits going at this moment to harden the heart of the Pontiff, which some hoped had begun to relent. It is said that this remarkable pair urged that all was now ripe, that the majority were enthusiastic, and that moreover if the Pontiff made concessions he would be dishonoured in history as a second Honorius.² This 'frightened the Pope,' said Archbishop Von Scherr.

The hopes brought back by the deputation to the minority were speedily dispelled. In the course of the morning Cardinal

¹ *Friedrich*, p. 409.

² *Quirinus*, p. 803; also the words of Archbishop Scherr, as quoted in *Tagebuch*, p. 409.

Rauscher waited on his Holiness to thank him in the name of the minority for the gracious reception of their deputation. The shrewd Austrian pointed out to his royal master the effects which would flow from the definition as framed by the majority. ‘It is too late,’ said the Pope; ‘the formula is already distributed to the bishops and has been discussed. Besides, the public session is convened. It is now impossible to yield to the wishes of the minority.’¹ On Friday night the Pope said that he had not seen the formula; on Saturday morning the Pope said that the formula was already distributed and discussed. And this formula was unchangeably to determine the fountain of doctrine, of ministerial authority, and of all power in a so-called Church. Friedrich, on writing down these words from the lips of his Archbishop, adds in a parenthesis, ‘One is ready to go crazed at the measureless frivolity with which the holiest questions are handled in Rome.’

That same morning a Congregation was held to consider the suggestions made by those who had given conditional votes. Two Spaniards, according to Quirinus (p. 804), had made two propositions tending to complete the repudiation of the collective authority of the universal Church by the Bishop of Rome. The proposed Decree, as it stood, limited his definitions to ‘matters which the Holy See had held from ancient times in common with other Churches.’²

This language, however vaguely, did recognise both antiquity and catholicity. The worthy Spaniard doubtless felt that the Vicar of God ought not to be limited by any such things; that he should be left free to define what he felt called to define. If the Holy Spirit had revealed tradition to him, how vain had been all the talk in past ages of bearing witness to the ancient, and, indeed, to the original, tradition! And if his power in all

¹ Related by Archbishop Scherr to the Theological Faculty at Munich. *Friedrich*, pp. 409, 410.

² *Quirinus*, p. 804. See the Draft in *Doc. ad Illus.*, ii., pp. 317, 318.—‘Quod antiquitus Apostolica Sedes et Romana cum ceteris tenet perseveranter ecclesias.’

Churches was ordinary and immediate, surely he was entitled to speak for them all! The committee had been of the same mind, and had adopted the proposal of the Spaniard that the above-quoted clause should be struck out. The Sub-Secretary cried, 'The amendment proposed to 76 is accepted by the committee : those who are in favour of accepting it, stand up.' Nearly all stood up. Ten or twelve stood up against it, and away went the antiquity and catholicity as expeditiously as any Cardinal could desire.¹

The inner lights of the Pontiff were thus freed from any restraint arising out of ancient views, and the local creed of Rome was freed from any restraint arising out of a common Christianity as between that city and other Churches. It required a Senate of Humanity, a divine representation of the human species, to deal so promptly and so easily with matters so portentous.

Now, however, came to pass a marvel, if anything could be marvellous there and then. The venerable men seated all around had spent their long lives in hearing and telling of one thing—the glory, the authority, the divinity of the Church, and the overwhelming conclusiveness of her consent. They were in possession of the truth ; they were in a state of grace; they were in a position to teach and lead the world simply by following the voice of the Church. All who did not hear the Church were, according to them, lost. All who did not accept the teaching formed by the assent of the Church, had God for their judge. Even when, in preparing the way for the change of base which they had foreseen before leaving home, some of them had appeared to throw tradition altogether overboard, it was only in order to substitute for it the general consent of the Church. Indeed, sound doctrine, perfect tradition, and trustworthy history could not, they thought, be conceived of as having a higher expression than the general consent of the Church. Which of us would have dared to tell devout Roman

¹ *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, p. 33.

Catholics that their own bishops, when once in Rome under the terror of the Pontiff and the Jesuits, would disavow the consent of the Catholic Church, and say that without it the word of a single man was quite as good? They may now attempt to explain the words 'not by consent of the Church,' as meaning something small; or even to say that Popes ever and always formally disclaimed the necessity of her consent. The world must leave them to do so; but they know, as well as we do, that had we said that their bishops would of a sudden put words like these into the creed, they would have called us calumniators. Yet what came to pass?

That came to pass which had often been hinted as necessary by the zealots during the Council, but had always been looked upon as impossible by most men of the minority, although a few had openly said that in such a Council nothing was impossible. Another Spaniard, when he gave his conditional vote, had proposed that the words of the Decree which said, 'The definitions of the Roman Pontiff are of themselves irreformable,' should be amended so as to read, 'The definitions of the Roman Pontiff are of themselves, and not by consent of the Church, irreformable.' Vitelleschi says that no information was given as to the authority at whose suggestion these metamorphic words were approved by the committee, but approved by the committee they were. So, without any opportunity of debate, the Under Secretary cried, 'The amendment under number 152, having been modified, is accepted by the committee;' and reading it, he added, 'Let those who are in favour of accepting it stand up.' The great majority stood up. 'Let those who are against accepting it stand up.' 'About thirty' stood up.¹ Thus were those ancient men called upon in their episcopal robes to extinguish the light of that lamp to which they had ministered oil all the days of their lives. They obeyed like soldiers, and the old, old light of a catholic consent was quenched for ever. Many of the eighty-eight were

¹ The *Acta Sanctæ Sedis* does not even profess to count exactly,—'about thirty (*triginta circiter*).

absent, and knew not of this new, swift, and crowning victory of the guild over the hierarchy.

Done in a moment! the Romish bishops had effaced from their law, and from their rule of faith, the consent of the Catholic Church! Talk of revolutions, of hasty parliamentary votes, of the sudden impulse of a mob; but where in history is there an instance of breaking with a long and loud resounding past, in such haste, and so irrevocably; irrevocably, not by the ordinary law which entails the consequences of an act upon the future, but irrevocably by the form and intent of the action itself? We know, alas! what these bishops are capable of representing; but it is for the unborn to judge the men who did that act and then faced round, saying that they changed nothing. And these men are to teach the human species the art of conserving all that they have 'inherited and proved'! The Church of the Popes had long ceased, in the eye of Protestants, to have a claim to catholicity. Now, however, in the eye of Liberal Catholics, she explicitly rejected catholicity by statutory and irreformable law. They saw her contract herself to the sect of one man and his retainers, to a religion made up of faith in one man, his inner light, and his *faits accomplis*. We by no means intend to say that the design of the bishops was to reject catholicity. We say that Liberal Catholics felt that they did it by repudiating the universal Church, and putting one man in the place that had been assigned by all their own antecedents to that universal Church. The repudiation is express and complete, and all attempts to explain it away only exhibit the men and their methods, without weakening the facts. What they have written, they have written. That day they drove a nail, and clenched it, which time itself can never draw. 'Not by consent of the Church' is now read on the mitre of the high priest. This act is the most complete reversal of a policy—and not of a mere policy, but of the pervasive principle of an ancient and widely established polity—to which the constitutional struggles of our day have given birth.

The slow but irresistible operation of principles had at last worked out its ultimate issue. Liberal Catholics were the first to see that the religion of the Pope had now really ceased to be Catholic, or even national, or indeed municipal,—that it had in fact become only palatial. They at once named it the religion of the Vatican. They did not so soon admit that the principle of one city church—not the mother, and not a model—being the mistress of all others, and practically the fountain of their faith, contained in itself the germ of all that had now come to fruit. That principle destroyed the divine doctrine of private judgment. It destroyed the divine ordinance of diversity for finite and erring creatures. It destroyed the divine authority of the Bible, in spite of all veils and fences to the contrary. It substituted an earthly for a heavenly centre of unity; a pyramid for the sun. It disfranchised so many as to pave the way for the disfranchisement of all. It exalted a few on grounds so futile as to prepare the way for exalting one on grounds of equal futility.

The sitting which began with deeds so very solemn, ended in another way. For once the poor Pope had been exposed to the plague of pamphlets in the Holy City. It is pathetic to read the wailing over the destiny that subjected so holy a being to this in addition to his other ‘martyrdoms,’ ‘Calvaries,’ ‘crucifixions,’ and such like words, to win a tear. Many of the vexatious writings were in Latin. Thus if they had the additional bitterness of being the work often of bishops, always of priests, they still had the veil of a dead language. Not a few, however, had been written in living tongues. Two of the latter, which cut dreadfully deep, were in French—*What is going on in the Council?* and *The Last Hour of the Council*. We are now to see how these are dealt with. It is announced by the First President that a certain protest will be distributed. So papers are handed round. During this process the Under-Secretary calls out, Let the Fathers take notice that the sitting is not over! Then from the pulpit, in the name of the Presi-

dents, he reads a protest against false reports in general, and the two pamphlets in particular. They were stinking calumnies and shameful lies—*putidissimæ calumniae . . . probosa mendacia*. The Italians and Spaniards, who could not have read them, cried, ‘We condemn them.’ The minority cried, ‘We do not condemn them.’ The President called upon those who did condemn them to stand up. Sambin says that so few remained seated that, to avoid exposing them to humiliation, the contrary was not put. Among these men Friedrich names Rauscher and Schwarzenberg. Two copies of the condemnation had been handed to every one of the bishops. The President now read a request that each would return one of them signed with his own name. This trap, however, was not successful. Haynald said that if the Presidents would translate *La Dernière Heure* into Latin, he and the rest of the Hungarians would be able to see if it was as bad as their Eminences had said it was.¹ The *Acta Sanctæ Sedis* make no mention of any demur, but notes that many prelates said, ‘Willingly, with all my heart, yes, even to blood!’ But why giving bad names to two pamphleteers should call forth such heroic resolutions is not obvious. Thus did an Ecumenical Council spend its last legislative moment in recording a condemnation of two pamphlets which obviously the bulk of those who gave sentence could not have read. The presentation to every man personally of the two papers, and the call to sign, coming from the chair, was a symptom not calculated to dissipate certain fears that had got abroad among the minority. It was reported that if they dared to give an adverse vote in the public session, two papers would be immediately presented to them, the one being a subscription to the dogma, the other being the resignation of their sees. If they did not sign the first, they must sign the second. They knew that in case they refused to sign both, they were within the walls of Rome. And suppose a bishop to have signed his resignation and then to find himself in the hands of the Papal

¹ *Quirinus*, pp. 806-7.

police! And men liable even to the suspicion of such menaces were free ‘judges and legislators!’

So ended the last of the General Congregations, being the eighty-sixth since the beginning. It will be ever memorable,—a monument of despatch and versatility. It renounced, as lights in doctrine, antiquity, catholicity, and the consent of the Church, and it denounced two French pamphlets, and gave to *Ce Qui se Passe au Concile* and *La Dernière Heure du Concile* an immortality in the formal Acts of that assembly denied to all the petitions, suggestions, deliberations, and votes of the whole hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church in their fourscore and six anxious and pregnant sittings in General Congregation.

For while the protest against these pamphlets, of which the wording is named by Vitelleschi as a sample of the violent language common in the Roman *bureaux* at the time, is actually printed among the Acts of the Council, those Acts contain not a word of the votes, proposals, or discussions of the General Congregations; not a hint of all the protests put in by the minority, not a hint of the voting in the great Congregation on July 13th, or, in fact, of anything that could give a knowledge of the processes, or of any other results than the lists of committees and the formulated Decrees. By processes we do not mean the ceremonial ones, for they are briefly described, but the legislative and deliberative ones, which are entirely omitted. The Bulls of the Pope and the Decrees of the Presidents as to procedure are printed; but no action of the bishops. When what has passed through the hands of the bishops becomes a Papal constitution, it of course appears. As to the historians, they indeed do give the voting on July 13th; but we believe that not one of those who wrote by or under authority, gives one of the documents of the protesting bishops, from the beginning of the Council to the end, or any indication of where they may be found. Vitelleschi tells how, on this same day, Cardinal Rauscher himself made a last desperate effort to impress the immovable Pope, and was received with scant courtesy.

That Saturday night, a number of downcast old men, each with more or less of a retinue, took leave of Rome. Some went by the desolate way to Civita Vecchia. On reaching that city, and beginning to breathe the free air of the sea, they might well wonder how long the red, white, and blue flag would warn away the red, white, and green; how long the eldest daughter of the Church would help the autocrat, whom they had left in the act of solemnly disclaiming the consent of the Church, to impose his obscure tyranny on this threadbare patch of land,—a land whereof the natural lot was neither poverty nor dependence upon the foreigner. Some of them took the less desolate way towards the North. In the clear July night they passed by Monte Rotondo, with Mentana not far off. When would Garibaldi be heard of anew? Or would the next dash at Rome be left to Garibaldi? Spoleto, Terni, and other places lost in 1860, would suggest the question: Will Ireland and Belgium find men for new crusades, and if so, will they be more successful? The lamps of Perugia, high on the hill, but pale in the advancing light, would recall tales of slaughter under Pius IX. Perhaps the prelates had not heard them, or had said that they were all lies. All of the Frenchman, or of the German, in their hearts would be drawn in one direction; all of the Papist in another. To talk of them as Catholics, after the deed consummated that day, was one of those solecisms to which men are condemned when history has outrun terminology. The Frenchman would naturally say, He who has repaid the restoration of twenty years ago, and the support given since then by deliberate insult of the greatest names of the Gallican dead, by coarse offences against every man of mark among the French living that dared to speak a dissentient word, and by the ostentatious abrogation of all the Gallican liberties, deserves not that the flag of France should longer shelter his policy. The German would naturally say, The attempt to undo the unity of the Fatherland, and once more to expose us through division to the incursions, the

burnings, and the plunderings of the French, is no less than diabolical ; and he that aims at breaking up Germany for the sake of weakening Italy, should be left to his deserts. But in such men, after all, the Frenchman or the German represented but the human instincts, not the drilled, trained thoughts, and the unchangeably moulded habits. The German, or the Frenchman, represented the boy, but the Papist represented the man. ‘The weakening of the individual will in the priest,’ of which Vitelleschi speaks, as one of the secrets of that mysterious zeal to-day for things which were esteemed untrue yesterday, is scarcely more striking than is the weakening of national sympathy, except when the interests of the Papacy are supposed to be connected with those of the nation. As the dawn of the Sunday morning came over the Umbrian Hills, its first beams showed the Fathers the gentle waters of the Lake Trasimene.¹ New battles were at hand. Would some other Hannibal have to content himself with looking at the walls of Rome from the distant heights ? Or would a new Lambert show foreigners how Italians could treat a Pope like a mortal and an offender ?

We may close this chapter with one specimen more of the practical preaching for the establishment of the new moral order, of the real Christian civilisation, which the scribes of the Court had kept under the eyes of all who sought, in their pages, for tidings of the great things which the Council was doing. Our last specimen was that of an English youth : this is that of a French one. Bravely fighting his gun at Monte Rotondo, fell young Bernard Quatrebarbes, the son of a Breton marquis, mortally wounded. When the victors of Mentana delivered the prisoners, no less than four cousins gathered around the pallet of the wounded Bernard. At Rome he was joined by his father, his sister, and other female relations. The day after his arrival in the city, his humble room in the hospital having been entered by Pius IX., ‘radiant with sovereign sweetness,’ as the writer expresses it, Bernard was naturally in ecstasy

¹ *Vauillot*, ii., 438.

at such an august apparition. The Pope desiring to see the wound of his crusader, and making the sign of the cross over it, said, ‘God will bless thee, my friend, as I bless thee.’ The Marquis announced to his wife the departure of her boy in three words, ‘Bernard in Paradise.’ ‘Words,’ exclaims the author, unconsciously signalising the fall of Rome from Christian hope,—‘Words worthy of the primitive Christians.’ Ay, but, thank God, primitive Christians before saying over their dead ‘in Paradise’ instead of ‘in Purgatory,’ did not wait till one fell fighting for the royalty of a bishop! Over the fisher drowned with his nets, over the mother who died in childbirth, over the sand-digger crushed underground, over the patrician dying amid freedmen and clients, they rejoiced with the joy of hope eternal. Christ had brought God nigh to them, and had brought them nigh to God. It was for later, darker ages to drag them back again into a dim region where a crowd of intervening patrons and all manner of priestly spells came between them and the bosom of a Father, between them and the home where all the brothers meet. It being natural to the primitive Christians to think and speak of their departed as being with the Lord, it would have been to them incredible that a day should come when Christian parents, before venturing to say over a devout and believing son that he was not in torments, must send him to fight to make a pastor a king. Amid such miserable beliefs, what a comfort to feel that the great Redeeming Father knows how to deal with those who, like good and brave young Quatrebarbes, verily believed that in meeting death for the Pope they were becoming martyrs for the glory of God.

Maria Sophia, ex-Queen of Naples, came so often to the bedside of the dying Bernard, that our narrator says she almost seemed to have taken up her abode in the hospital, and sometimes she was moved to tears. By that bedside also did her husband say to the Marquis, ‘How noble is your son!’ To the Marquis also wrote another expectant exile, the Count of

Chambord, saying that he admired ‘the short but bright career of Bernard, and his marvellous end.’ It was the Colonel of Bernard that told the father of his departure, and in these words: ‘I have another patron in heaven.’ But above all when the news was conveyed to the Pope, he said: ‘Bernard Quatrebarbes is a saint in heaven.’ At home in Brittany, while the corpse lay in the chapel of the château, the people flocked around the bier; but it was ‘more to invoke the departed than to pray for him.’ The Bishop of Laval pronounced over him ‘not the praises of a dead man, but the eulogium of a martyr.’ The new Hermit who preaches the new crusade thus concludes his memoir:—

‘The death of Bernard Quatrebarbes, who sacrificed to God youth, fortune, and pleasure, a tranquil life and the joys of home, in order to march in the defence of the truth, of virtue, of the Church, will awaken the drowsy soul of more than one young cavalier. Bernard is already a martyr, and he will be an apostle.’¹

CHAPTER VIII.

Grief of M. Veuillot—Final Deputation and Protest.

SUNDAY, July 17th, was rather more of a fast than of a feast, for M. Veuillot. He says, ‘War and oppositions are cruel clouds.’ Bad as were the rumours of war, those of ‘rebellion’ among the bishops were still worse. It had evidently become known that the minority were not to be cowed into gracing the public solemnity with their compulsory *Placet*. This was a profound humiliation. It disproved a thousand promises and prognostics. Perhaps it spoiled serious calculations, as well as those festive displays that had long been foretold. It was even rumoured

¹ *Civiltà*, VII., ix., 542-548 and 664-670.

that the bishops would go into the open session and disturb the solemnity, by saying *Non placet*,—ay, M. Veuillot had heard, by shouting it and outrageously repeating it in the face of the Pope.¹ While nothing was more desirable than that, to prove the freedom of the Council, two or three should say *Non placet*, any serious number doing so would be detestable. The refusal of the non-contents to vote at all would be only one degree less bad. M. Veuillot, however, discovered that many whose departure, ‘or rather desertion,’ had been reported were still really in Rome. But, on the other hand, he saw carriages at the doors of leaders of the ‘tormenting and tormented’ Opposition; at those of the Archbishops of Paris and Lyons, and of Cardinals Rauscher and Matthieu. Even the Via Frattina was visited to note the symptoms at the door of Maret. After night-fall, Veuillot cries, Many are gone, and many more are going in the morning. They will really absent themselves. ‘I cannot help thinking of a caricature. It represented some seditious fellows in a scare, who said, “Now is the moment to show ourselves; let us hide!”’

As the noontide of that July Sunday blazed upon the Vatican, a deputation had entered the presence chamber, headed by Darboy and Simor, Primate of Hungary. They came to make one last attempt to procure the prorogation of the Council without the promulgation of the dogma. Their only answer was the old *Non possumus*. Then the last of the luckless series of protests was solemnly delivered. They had not heart enough to fight, and had too much conscience to submit. So they took the middle course, and spoiled for ever the pretext of moral unanimity, except the dead unanimity of form. Their fears, or their views of unity and reverence, would not allow them in public to withstand the Pope. He had justly calculated the effect upon them of throne and tiara, with the fear of possible degradation. They had not, perhaps, sufficiently calculated what might have been the effect on him of honest men stand-

¹ Vol. ii., 427.

ing up one after another in their appointed place, and saying before all the Churches, as a wiser than they had done of a better than he, that he was to be blamed. Hard as Pius IX. may be, eighty-eight solemn non-contents uttered in his face in the same place where five days before they had been uttered in the face of God and the Church, might have found some heart even in the breast in which Romans sometimes say that there is none. A strange thing to be said of one who in many respects exhibits strong feeling! But the general estimate of Pius IX., where he is known, presents many contradictions. They would have exposed, it is true, Pope Pius IX. to a temporary check, yet they might have saved the Papacy from an irrevocable error. But in proportion as the Papacy had become weak in producing conviction, it had concentrated its strength on the means of producing submission. Its success in that art was now to be its own punishment. No Protestant had expected any effectual resistance from men trained as Romish bishops. Any real tenacity of conscience shown during the Council, was due to nobler influences spread abroad in countries where the ascendancy of Rome is not complete. There is, to our mode of thinking, something not merely incongruous and grotesque, but a great deal worse, in putting forward the paltry plea of personal offence, or personal consideration, when the matter in hand is a dogma that is to mould the religion of millions for ever. The fact that these prelates do put forward such a notion countenances the statements often made about men giving as the reason for their votes that they could not refuse the Holy Father or hurt his feelings. Vitelleschi thinks that the fear of being required to resign their Sees or subscribe the dogma was one of the elements in determining the minority to leave Rome before the definition (p. 212). If so, seeing them escape from that dilemma would be one of the causes of the mortification shown by the majority, as expressed by Veuillot. We give the last of the protests in full¹ :—

¹ Friedberg, p. 622; Quirinus, 797.

'Most Blessed Father, in the Congregation held on the 13th of this month we gave our votes upon the proposed Decree of the first dogmatic constitution of the Church of Christ.

'It is known to your Holiness that there were eighty-eight Fathers who, pressed by conscience and moved by love of the Holy Church, gave their votes in the words *Non placet*, that sixty-two others voted in the words *Placet iuxta modum*, and that, moreover, about seventy were absent from the Council and abstained from voting. To these are to be added a number who, from infirmity or other serious reasons, have returned to their dioceses.

'In this manner, our votes have been made known to your Holiness and to the whole world, and it has been made evident by how many bishops our opinion is approved; and thus have we discharged our office and duty.

'From the time above stated, nothing has occurred to change our judgment; but, on the contrary, several things have been added, and those exceedingly serious, which have strengthened us in our purpose.

'Confirming, then, by this document our votes, we have determined to abstain from the public session to be held on the 18th. That filial piety and reverence, which lately brought our deputies to the feet of your Holiness do not permit us openly, and in the Father's face, to say *Non placet* in a case so closely concerning the person of your Holiness.

'And, indeed, the votes that would be given in the public session could only repeat those already given in the Congregation.

'We, therefore, return to our flocks without delay, for after so long an absence we are much needed on account of the rumours of war, and especially on account of the great spiritual necessities. We return grieving that, because of the sad juncture of circumstances, even peace and tranquillity of conscience is disturbed among the faithful.

'Meanwhile, commanding with all our hearts the Church of God, and your Holiness, to the grace and protection of our Lord Jesus Christ, we are of your Holiness the most devoted and most obedient sons.'

Leaving, then, in the hands of the Pope this solemn confirmation of a belief registered by a formidable array of bishops, that he ought not to be proclaimed as the infallible representative of God, they turned their backs on the palace which had witnessed their many humiliations. Their allusion to the things which had been added since the 13th as being 'exceedingly serious,' is another of the many witnesses out of their own mouths against their subsequent statements. Their clear statement that did they vote in the session it could only be to repeat their

former vote, seals with the seal of deliberate misrepresentation many solemn assertions since that day made under mitres.

It was a grief to the soul of M. Veuillot to learn that the Ambassador of France had graced with his presence the departure of Darboy. De Banville had accompanied the Archbishop to the station, escorted by Mérode, with Monsignor Vecchiotti, and Father Trullet. The recalcitrant Archbishop was even placed in ‘a kind of carriage of honour;’ a fact which reminded the Argus of the *Univers* that a certain bishop had said, We go away conquerors, but we leave some wounded on the field. ‘This fine carriage seemed to me an ambulance.’¹ Thus, poor Darboy took his way towards the storm-cloud, blackening behind the hills, in the after-clap of which he alone of all the host was to find a bloody grave.

The Monday morning dawned heavily over Rome. As the eyes of the last portion of the fleeing minority were sadly tracing the outlines of the hills on the upper course of the Tiber, while those of the first portion were tracing the forms of the outlying Alps, and a few were watching morn as it spread over the waves of the Mediterranean, a Pope for the first time rose in Rome with the consciousness that ere sunset he would be infallible, not only in fact, but also in law. His less happy predecessors had claimed that crown, but never had received it. Now he was about, with the consent of the Church, to put on the power to be infallible for ever, ‘without the consent of the Church.’ Had ever diplomacy won such a victory? had ever an oligarchy so completely signed itself away? Tell him that the temporal power was of no spiritual value! But could all that have been accomplished except within the walls of a strong city? As Pius IX. looked from the Papal apartments across the Tiber, the Pincian was gloomy, and the Sabine Hills were hid in clouds under a threatening sun. But he would remember the day of his taking possession, and how gloom had turned to rainbow; the day of the return from Gaeta, and how

¹ Vol. ii., p. 436.

No date of year!

What was involved in the Apotheosis? 397

the sun had opened from the west at the right moment; above all, the day of 'The Immaculate,' and how the sun had seemed glad of the sight. True, the dutiful luminary had failed on the opening day of the Council, but the Jesuit Fathers had written that the solemnity would be brilliant at its close, and that the city would blaze with triumph, as Ephesus had done in the year 431. And was not the throne so placed in the Council Hall that, all being propitious, the beams would fall as they had done on the day of the Immaculate; and surely the Virgin would not fail to send them. At all events, it was certain that he would lie down that night not only the Pope of the Immaculate, but the Pope of the Infallible—the first human being in the records of the world to whom a number of the creatures of God had deliberately given the right of telling to them and to their succeeding generations what they were to believe for ever and ever. The deifying of an emperor, either in the plains of Babylon or in the temples of Rome, was a little thing as compared with the apotheosis now about to be performed. The dogmas of the emperor were not to be eternal on earth, though he might cause himself to be decreed immortal in heaven. The word 'apotheosis' was perfectly natural to the pen of Vitelleschi, or of any other Liberal Catholic who dared to speak what he thought. But it is nevertheless true that deification among the heathen, whether ancient or modern, involved little exaltation compared with that now to be given to the Bishop of Rome. They who measure heathen gods by the scriptural conception of God, do not at first see the force of such a remark; but after opportunities of observation, or after time and reflection, its grounds will become sufficiently plain. A Theseus or a Rama, an Antinous or an Augustus, had a lowly part in ruling eternal destinies compared with that to be now assigned to the Count and Priest Mastai-Ferretti.

The monasteries and nunneries sent forth a contingent, as on the opening day; but where were the proud vehicles and the pressing throngs? Vitelleschi says that two or three houses in

the city were decorated. How dead was the indifference denoted by such language on an occasion absolutely unprecedented, cannot be conveyed to the minds of those who do not know what the people of a southern city can do when they really mean to decorate. As the places for spectators in the Hall filled up, it was whispered from one to another, ‘No crowned heads.’ An Infanta of Portugal was the lone flower of royalty

‘Where once a garden smiled.’

Even ambassadors failed. France, the eldest daughter, was not there. Spain, the Catholic, was not there. Portugal, the faithful, was not there. Austria, the apostolic, was not there. Bavaria was not there. Poland was dead. Italy was alive again, but her heart and hope were elsewhere. Belgium and Holland had each sent a consul, the one to welcome infallibility, with its constitution condemned by the Church, the other with its heresy. Vitelleschi mentions a representative of the Principality of Monaco. The *Giornale di Roma* is not so worldly minded as to specify any state, but says that members of the diplomatic corps were present.¹

About nine o’clock the Cardinals, Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, and Generals, all in red, began to stream in. Five hundred and thirty-five seats were soon occupied. It thus appeared that there were some two hundred less than at the opening. About twenty had died.² Several were ill. Some, in Rome, were absent from disinclination to attend.³ Of the minority only two now changed sides. Of these, one was a demonstrative Oppositionist—Landriot, of Rheims. This conspicuous absence of the minority was a disappointment and a humiliation, though it was nothing more. Even the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis* says that its effect was traceable on the countenances of the Fathers. They grieved for the obstinacy of their brethren.

¹ *Civiltà*, VII, xi., 367.

² The names are given in *Friedberg*, p. 149.

³ Vitelleschi says that of 157 absent only 38 were accounted for. The rest represented the Non-contents.

Indeed, in the Congregation where the vote was taken, some, with clasped hands, had implored their friends to give up their false opinion at last. This is probably the other side of the Deschamps scene. Still the conqueror had his triumph, though he had not the satisfaction of seeing the captives follow in his train. It was Cæsar without Vercingetorix. It would have been a proud moment for the resident Cardinals had Rauscher and Schwarzenberg made Vienna and Prague bow down to Rome. Had the sturdy Darboy done homage for Paris, it would have been a sign to the Curia that the new world of the Jesuit seers was at last actually above the horizon—a new world which, like the land so often sighted by the sailors of Columbus, had ever seemed to move farther away. The readers of M. Veuillot can well imagine into what extasies he would have fallen, and with what dithyrambs his pages would have detonated, had his ears been permitted to hear Dupanloup pronounce his *Placet*. This was not to be. Those bishops were not the men to stand up in their places and contend; yet were they not so thoroughly beaten as ostentatiously to submit. Their paper confirmation of their legislative vote came like an impertinent parley to tease the conquerors. What ought to have been either a combat or a *fête* was neither. It was a ceremonial of which even the *Civiltà* quotes its description from the *Giornale di Roma*, while M. Veuillot himself is too much affected to write more than a few lines,—as if silence was the vestment which his strong emotions were wont to put on. In his after touches he often speaks of the glory of the dogma, but we do not remember that he ever alludes to the glory of that day. The Protestant *Fromman*, whom we have not been accustomed to quote, though very glad to consult, called the ceremony tedious; but that was unpardonable.

The Pope did not enter on this occasion, as on former ones, between Antonelli and Mertel, but between Grassellini and Mertel. Had Antonelli, because of having failed to give his vote in the Congregation, lost his wonted place on the day

when the fruit was to be plucked? At the preceding session, Friedrich had watched the worshippers of the sun; but to-day there was no sun to worship, and no Friedrich to note the rise and fall of the quicksilver in the box of the so-called theologians. The hall and city, according to Vitelleschi, 'wore a cold and severe aspect.' The 8th of December seemed to have dropped its mantle on the 18th of July: Nature now renewed its depressing utterances, and man did not reply with much spirit. Perhaps, however, ere the moment of promulgation arrived, the Roman azure would be in the ascendant, and hearts would be gladdened at the right time. Indeed, the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, in contradiction to all profane authors, states that just before the Pope uttered his sentence the gloom somewhat cleared up. It does not attempt to say that the sun shone.

After the preparatory ceremonies, Fessler and Valenziani approached the throne. The Secretary handed the constitution *Pastor Eternus* to the Pontiff, with its chapters and its canons making a new Church, if ever a new constitution made a new corps, and making, as Pius IX. hoped, the commencement of a new era for the kingdoms of this world, all of which, with the glory of them, had been by some one promised to him after this day. The so-called Christian Bishop took the fateful document from the obsequious German, containing as it did the rights of all other bishops in the Papal world self-resigned. He then handed it to the obsequious Italian, containing as it did his claim to the rights of all kings and of all mankind self-assumed. That constitution professed to give to him, or rather to recognise as inhering in him, authority over all territories on earth, and over all those actions of man that possessed any moral character. Over the entire sphere of human accountability henceforth and for ever it was for him to reign as should seem to him right. Valenziani ascended the desk, and read out the title of the Decree. He then sat down, and while the sky grew blacker, the house darker, and the hearts of men more heavy with an impression of something terrible, he read chapter after

chapter, until at last he reached the close, and the house echoed back his cadence, with the word of the Pope's self-written doom, *Irreformable*,—‘The definitions of the Roman Pontiff are of themselves, and not by consent of the Church, *irreformable*.’

When the chief priests of Jerusalem, at the feet of our suffering Lord, opened their lips to revile Him, the first word which they unwittingly uttered was, ‘He saved others.’ When the chief priests of Rome, at the feet of him whom they called the Vicar of Christ, opened their lips to pronounce him unerring, the last word they unwittingly uttered was IRREFORMABLE! After a moment’s pause came the sealing Canon, ‘If any shall presume to contradict this our definition, let him be anathema.’

The reader ceased. The storm alone was speaking. For a moment no human tone disturbed the air. But memory was repeating two terrific words, and imagination kept saying that the winds were whispering,

Irreformable!

Anathema!

Valenziani rose, and sending his voice athwart the gloom, said, ‘Most Reverend Fathers, are the Decrees and Canons contained in this Constitution agreed to?’

Upon this he left the desk, and Jacobini, the Sub-Secretary, ascending it, called out the name of Cardinal Mattei, who was absent from old age. He then called ‘Constantine, Bishop of Porto;’ and Cardinal Patrizi, rising, and taking off his mitre, said, *Placet*. The voice near the throne made the darkening hall to echo *Placet*, and the voice near the door repeated the echo, *Placet*. Then the scrutineers recorded the vote. Cardinal Amat was next called, and his *Placet* and some five or six others sounded harmoniously in the deepening gloom. Jacobini then called Frederick Joseph, Archbishop of Prague. The princely priest who from the age of thirty-three had worn the purple, and who was to represent the house of Schwarzenberg and the Church of Bohemia,—that Church

imposed by burnings and by blood,—responded not. There was a moment's pause and a sense of a want. *Absent*, cried the voice near the throne. *Absent*, replied the voice near the door; and the influences from without were seconded by a damping influence from within. The next name was that of Cardinal Corsi, a man of repute for piety, who was well known to be averse to the definition. According to Vitelleschi, he and the other dissentient Cardinals drew their scarlet hats over their eyes and remained silent. But they wore mitres, not hats. Of the rest, Quirinus asserts that, besides the Cardinal Vicar, Patrizi, only two put into their *Placet* spirit enough to stand up, and they were Bonaparte and Panebianco. Fourth after Corsi came the name of the senior French Cardinal. ‘James, Archbishop of Besançon,’ cried Jacobini; but Cardinal Mathieu did not respond. *Absent*, cried the official voice. *Absent*, echoed the fellow official. Even France seemed failing. Thrice had the tranquillising *Placet* cheered the still deepening shadows, when Jacobini came to the notable name of ‘Joseph Othmar, Archbishop of Vienna.’ But Rauscher was far away, and once more did the thunderous air thrill with the depressing sound, *Absent*. Now followed a successive roll of more than twelve *Placets*, and then came the name of Philip, Archbishop of Bologna. All watched Cardinal Guidi, who pronounced a *Placet*. The Pope closely eyed him, and when the creature delivered his judgment before earth and heaven in favour of the dogma which just one month previously he had, in the same place, solemnly proposed to lay under an anathema, his royal master said, ‘Poor man!’ or, as others report it, ‘Good man!’ but Vitelleschi remarks that in Italian they might both mean the same thing. To Guidi succeeded two staunch *Placets*, from Bonnechose and Cullen, but next was called Gustavus of Santa Maria Trasponentina. Eyes looked for another prince-priest who represented the house of Hohenlohe and the feelings of Bavaria, but there was no response. Hohenlohe, like Rauscher and Schwarzenberg, was *absent*.

After the list of Cardinals was exhausted, the patriarchal Sees were called. Two Sees were especially connected with the tradition of Peter. After men of genuine Italian name, Antici-Mattei and Ballerini, had, for Constantinople and for Alexandria, answered *Placet*, was called the name of Antioch. Its Patriarch was named Jusseff, and the call evoked no response; so Antioch, the See of Peter, and *absent*, the sign of disapprobation, were set in men's minds together. Of course the Roman Valerga said *Placet* for Jerusalem. Then came the other city connected with the life of Peter, and when Audu, whose secret experience after his first audacity in venturing to differ from Pius IX. was known to all, was called to answer for Babylon, all expected that he would have been overcome like Guidi. But no. Oriental servility did not equal Roman, and so the reply made for Babylon was *Absent*. *La Dernière Heure du Concile* asserts that as Audu had been sent for by the Pope, so had Jusseff been sent for by the authorities of the Propaganda, 'to know by what right he dared to bear testimony to the belief of the East without having previously submitted his speech to revision' (p. 4). Next came the primatial Sees. Where was the Primate of France? Where the Primate of Hungary? They, too, among the *absent*. And of the Archbishops, where were those of Paris, of Milan, and of Munich? Where the Nestor of the English-speaking group, John of Tuam? These were painful deficiencies. Rome, the little city, calling, and Vienna, the great one, refusing to respond! Rome, the dependent, appealing, and Paris, the patroness, refusing to hear! Rome, the representative of small States, leading, and Munich declining to follow! Still, in numbers if not in influence the roll of *Placets* from among the Archbishops presented a very large majority. Among the bishops, the first name called was that of the very aged Losanna, of Biella, one of the staunchest opponents. So the first reply, though for an Italian bishop, was *Absent*. Then a flow of *Placets*, frequently chequered by an *Absent*. In all, says Vitelleschi, nearly one

hundred and fifty bishops were absent, many of them men who held the most illustrious Sees.¹ The *Acta Sanctæ Sedis* confesses to one hundred and twelve absentees from among those called; which number did not, of course, include men who had already obtained leave of absence. The number who were present was five hundred and thirty-five. In this whole list the uniform responses were either *Placet* or *Absent* till the name of the Bishop of Caizzo, a Neapolitan, was called. The official reported his vote as *Placet*. Caizzo raised his voice and loudly uttered *Non placet*. Then, again, to the end, *Placet* followed *Placet*, alternating with the voice of the rolling thunder. Finally was called Fitzgerald of Little Rock in America. Thinking that he alone of the Fallibilists was present, he had begged not to be brought forward; but now that another bishop had given a negative vote he responded, *Non placet*.² This set tongues agoing. It was roundly asserted that the appearance of the Neapolitan and the American had been arranged for, in order to give an air of freedom. Vitelleschi naturally thinks that it is needless to search so far for motives. Yet, the *Ciriltà* makes a display of these two votes, saying that without them it would have been alleged that the Fathers were not free. It tells of a correspondent of some of the 'bad' papers who on hearing the first *Non placet* was evidently annoyed, and being asked by a friend the cause of that annoyance said, 'This negative vote spoils all for us.'³ The *Ciriltà* quotes a description of how Riccio, the Neapolitan, after the definition, went down on his knees and said, *Credo*, I believe; and how Fitzgerald pressed his episcopal cross to his breast and said, 'Now I believe. Now do I also firmly believe.'⁴ When all the votes had been delivered, the scrutineers and notaries brought to the Secretary of the Council a statement of the result. The Secretary, followed by the scrutineers and notaries, advanced to the steps of the throne. There they all knelt down.

¹ P. 216.² Vitell. and *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*.³ *Ciriltà*, VII., xi., 347.⁴ Ibid., VII., xi., pp. 479, 480.

The Secretary ascended the steps and read, 'Blessed Father, the Decrees and Canons are agreed to by all the Fathers, two excepted.'

All this time the gloom was deep. The 'voice of the Lord' again and again peeled over the city. Thunderbolts more than once struck close to the Cathedral. Some glass in the windows of the apse just behind the throne was broken. Some, according to Jesuit writers, said, Providence is proclaiming the downfall of Gallicanism. Some, according to the *Acta Sanctæ Sedis*, said, The demon is disturbed, the storm shows that this does not please him. This interpretation would seem to have been that of the learned editor, for he adds, 'The thunderbolts which the Jupiter of the Pagans forged did the city no harm.' Many said, God is installing the new Moses upon the new Sinai. This, at least with those who wrote, was evidently the prevailing interpretation. Wise men said, Hush! it is the voice of the Lord, and in His temple let every one speak of His glory, and of His glory alone. But to those superhuman tones set no words of thine. God is His own interpreter. He, in His own way, will tell, and in His own time, whether that is the artillery of an installation or of a dethronement.

The moment had come. Now was to be spoken the word so oft invoked in apostrophe, analogue, and prayer,—the word for which many had pictured a universe in chaos as waiting in blind but agonising throes,—the word which so-called Christian journals and Christian ministers had, times unnumbered, described as the voice of God pronouncing the creative fiat, Let there be light. But where was the sun? According to many promises and to careful arrangements, he was at this moment to pour down upon the Lawgiver while announcing to all people, nations, and languages, the new law that changeth not, a radiance which would be as if angels were unfolding their wings above him and around. But the sun would not! The priest, in his conflict with chaos, was, at the supreme moment, left to the light of his own beloved wax candles. That light

which his taste tells him adorns the house of God in the eye of day, and teaches celestial truths to immortal men, became at last of real use.

The High Priest arose from his throne. All hearts stood still. He thought, and they thought, that he was about to proclaim himself unerring. But had not the wine been spirited away between the cup and the lip? The faults incident to composing in a committee, and those incident to amending in a hurry, were both embedded in the Decree. All it said of the infallibility of the Pope was derived and comparative; he is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed in defining doctrine regarding faith and morals. History had conquered dogma here as it had done in the chapter on authority. The declaration was not that the Church was as infallible as the Pope, which would have been the order had the historical consciousness traced the infallibility of the Church as derived from that of the Pope. The declaration was that the Pope was as infallible as the Church,—a proof that his infallibility was derived from hers, and that historical consciousness dictated that order. This comparative infallibility was all that was ascribed to the Pope in this artful but unskilful composition. But to what, according to the same article, did the infallibility of the Church amount? This was rendered by the wording the point all essential, and the standard beyond which infallibility could not extend. The Church was in the same article, and in words the most positive, dealt with as a body the consent of which was not to be taken into account. All, therefore, which the great Word had brought forth, was a declaration that the Pope was as infallible as a body whose consent was not to be taken into account. The world may be well content. The crafty were caught in their own gin when they renounced the consent of the Church. When men have long and successfully argued in a circle, it is a delicate thing all at once, in the heat of a July day, to break one half of the circle, and then to declare that the other half is

perfectly round, quite as round as the whole. Historically, the infallibility of the Church was first of all made the base and measure of that of the Pope. Then, diplomatically, the infallibility of the Church was reduced to a nullity. This nullity, by inexorable logic, falls back on all the infallibilities grown out of it, or measured by it. So the Decree is chaos in spite of all the candles. But on one point it speaks not comparatively but positively. Without comparison with anything on earth or above the earth, the Decrees of the Pope are pronounced irreformable. That is the one and the only indisputable result.

The aspirant after infallibility stood, about, as he imagined, to pronounce the word. He opened his lips, and by the candle-light read : ‘The Decrees and Canons contained in the constitution just read are agreed to by all the Fathers, two excepted. We, therefore, with the approval of the Sacred Council, confirm these and those as now read, and define them by apostolic authority.’

The anathema attached to the definition of infallibility strikes below the feet of Protestants. It only anathematises those who contradict the definition. Protestants do not stoop to do so. They may freely admit that the Pope is as infallible as the Church which made him irreformable, and for once they may believe more than the Pope, by admitting that the Church is as infallible as he. They certainly are not tempted to deny that the Pope, whether in his Decrees or out of them, is irreformable. Here, again, they believe more than the Pope.

The *Civiltá* states that now burst out a loud acclamation among the Fathers, accompanied with salvos of artillery. The small crowd of priests and nuns, and such like, as Vitelleschi says, about the door of the Hall raised a shout. Quirinus says that the nuns cried ‘*Papa mio*’—My Pope. According to the *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, St. Peter’s was very full of people, who broke forth in such applause that you would scarcely have believed that you were in the temple of the Prince of

the Apostles, hearing it echo again and again with these unwonted sounds.

The Irreformable then addressed his bishops in the following allocution. In order to do so, according to the *Stimmen*, he had to make several vain attempts, owing to the repeated applause of the Fathers; an applause which recalls a sad word of Vitelleschi, that some are never so jubilant as when they have placed a new yoke on their necks. At length the thunders of applause were still, and the waiting world was ready to hear the first utterance of the first human being ever set up on a throne in a temple, by hundreds of men of full age and of sound reason, to utter to all the earth words never to be questioned or amended, much less recalled. Hush! *The Infallible* gives forth the first oracle in his now acknowledged plenitude of power. Does it sound like ‘the word of God,’ at whose potent spell a disordered world will rise to new order and repose, or like that of an old man chiding the absent bishops who had not adorned the triumph of the day?

‘This exalted authority of the Roman Pontiff, venerable brethren, does not oppress, but assists, does not destroy, but builds up and often confirms in dignity, unites in affection, and strengthens and protects the rights of brethren—that is, of the bishops. Let those who now judge in the earthquake know that the Lord is not in the earthquake. Let them remember that, a few years ago, holding different views, they copiously expressed themselves as of our own opinion, and that of the majority of this great assembly; but they then judged in the calm. In judging of the same case, can we have two opposing consciences? God forbid! May God, therefore, enlighten their minds and their hearts; and as He alone works great marvels, may He illuminate their minds and hearts, so that all may come to the breast of their Father, that of the unworthy Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, who loves them, who esteems them, and who longs to be one with them. And so, bound together in the bond of charity, may we be able to fight the battle of the Lord, so that our enemies may not deride us, but may rather fear us, and may in time lay down the weapons of wickedness before the truth; and may we all be enabled to say with St. Augustine, “Thou hast called me into Thy wonderful light, and lo, I see!”’¹

The bishops applauded, and the journals found the allocution

¹ *Civiltà*, VII., xi., 366.

divine. The Liberal Catholics, however, felt that when the Pope said, 'I desire to be one with them,' he meant, 'I desire to see them submit to me.' The grave point was, that this being the first utterance from the chair after he had been solemnly declared to be as infallible as the Church, an utterance made—if ever one could be made—in the exercise of his office as pastor of the universal Church, it contained a misstatement of fact and a misconception of doctrine. The Pope, occupied with the absentees, ventured roundly to assert that they who now opposed had been a few years ago fully of his opinion and of that of the majority. If ever a public misstatement deserved to be called by a strong short name, this one did. Had the language of the Decree, now lifted to the level of the law that changeth not, been put by a Protestant, as the doctrine of their Church, before Schwarzenberg and Rauscher, before Darboy and Dupanloup, before Strossmayer, Kenrick, Clifford, and MacHale, any day previous to the year 1870, they would have railed at the Protestant as a slanderer, and perhaps would not have let him escape without an episcopal curse. Would not Spalding have sneered at D'Aubigné as a fool and a false witness had he said that the Pope could make a dogma without either the counsel of bishops or the consent of the Church? No, the ears of the Pope were full of words of witness; the bureaux of the Council contained document after document in evidence that the statement which he now dared to make when none dared to contradict, was not true, and was known not to be true. Those bishops, in order to please the Pope, had unwisely, as they now felt, stretched the doctrine of primacy, which they did hold, till it looked to unpractised eyes very like Papal infallibility. True, they had done this in what seemed rather to be addresses of ceremony than formularies of doctrine; for whenever infallibility itself had been nakedly presented to them, even without the adjunct of ordinary jurisdiction in every diocese, and without any repudiation of the consent of the Church, they had mustered the manhood to oppose it. The Pope neither

stated the facts nor discriminated between opinion and opinion. He did state as fact what was not fact, and confounded opinions that differed. Friedrich, with the acute author of the *Epistola Obscurorum Virorum*, and not a few others, thinks that he is personally incapable of understanding theological distinctions, and that he could not explain what the doctrine of Papal infallibility means. This seems to be impossible, and yet there is very much to prevent one from pronouncing it ridiculous. But whether he is capable of distinguishing in such a case or not is a very slight matter. The fact that remains for us is, that his first utterance from the acknowledged seat of infallibility was wholly occupied with the absent bishops, that he insinuated that they had a double conscience, and that the grounds on which he made that insinuation were incorrect in fact and inaccurate in thought. Had the question whether the Papacy was a divine organ of truth, or merely a contrivance of clever old men, liable to be overseen, like other mortals, in their words and deeds, been designedly subjected to a fair test, we can with difficulty conceive of one fairer or more conclusive, than that first utterance from the recognised seat of inerrancy. There is nothing divine in it, and the human elements do not rise above a very ordinary level.

The city was silent and chill. Instead of the glorious triumph of fireworks 'representing heaven,' instead of saintly marvels and prodigies, which had been often hinted to the elect people as awaiting them when the great day should come, there was a sense of collapse, and albeit a strange uncomfortable feeling as if heaven had taken the spectacle of the day into its own hand and had said, *Non placet*. We can form but a faint idea of how much, in such a case, mere external impressions sway a community trained like the one of which we speak. It was as if the salvos from St. Angelo, the feeble voice of the Irreformable, had been swallowed up in the salvos of the *shiss*, the voice of the Sole Infallible. The *Giornale di Roma* and the *Civilità*, the *Univers* and the *Unità*, would have spared no

epithets in denouncing the man who three months before should have said that, on the night when the creative word, the fiat, Let there be light, should be uttered ; on the night when the patient voice of the people and of the priests should be hushed under 'the voice of God' proclaiming infallibility, a noble Roman would pen what Vitelleschi that night quietly wrote down, 'The government offices, the religious establishments, and a few private houses, were illuminated ; but the rest of the city remained in perfect silence and profound darkness.'

The concluding words of the Roman writer, in narrating the triumph of the day, are not wholly indifferent to us in England (p. 221) :—

'History is bound to award to the author and originator of every work the praise or blame which is due to him. All must remember the part taken by the Fathers of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, and Monsignor Manning, Archbishop of Westminster, in promoting the dogma of the personal infallibility of the Pope, and all know that it was their mind and their will that carried it. On the day of the promulgation of the dogma, Monsignor Manning received as a gift from the Society of the Jesuits, a portrait of Bellarmine, with the following inscription :—

Henrico Edwardo Manning,
Archiep. Westmonast.
Sodales Soc. Jesu;
Collegii Civilitatis Catholicee,
Sessionis IV. Concilii Vaticani
Mnemosynon.'

It is said that the portrait was really that of St. Charles Borromeo.

One other note was often made as to this memorable day. It was the same day on which was done the deed that irreversibly sealed the fall of the Second Empire, and consequently the fall of its pendant and *portége*, the Papal throne. The declaration of war was delivered in Berlin on the day following, and must have left Paris that day !

The reader having already had several specimens, and fair ones, of *Ce Qui se Passe au Concile*, is in a position, so far as

relates to it, to form his own opinion of its 'stinking calumnies,' to adopt the characteristic language of the Most Eminent, Most Reverend, and Right Reverend Fathers of the Council. But as to *La Dernière Heure du Concile* (*The Last Hour of the Council*), we may at this point fitly give a few examples. It speaks of 'Rules imposed in violation of the most manifest rights of the Council, of Commission chosen beforehand, of illusory votes, of an oppressive tutelage, of discussions without order and without aim, of modifications of the Rules as arbitrary as they were multiplied.' It asserts that as to the minority public calumnies were not spared them; that their speakers were more than once forced to leave the desk without being able to explain much less to defend their views; while the majority from the beginning took the reasons of the minority for insults, and rendered back insults for reasons; and that the petitions of the minority were not only left without effect, but without answer. It pictures the Jesuits as meeting the bishops after three centuries of feigned truce on the ground where their General Laynez, defeated at Trent, had left them; but as now coming perfectly prepared for the battle, while the bishops had not foreseen anything:—

'To-day it is not the episcopate that refuses to hear Father Laynez, but it is Father Laynez who, master of the field, does not even deign to listen to the episcopate, and announces to it that the question has been long decided. . . . The day that Pius IX. said, There shall be a Council, the Company of Jesus said, I shall be the Council. We have seen three of its doctors absorb both the doctrinal power of the august assembly, and its right of initiative. The bishops have been called to sanction what the Jesuits have written, and there is the whole history of the Council.'

Speaking of the Propaganda, the writer declares that it holds in its hands all the Vicars Apostolic, and most of the Oriental bishops. Taking advantage of its annual grants, it gives week by week to the prelates who are supported by them that special impulse which shapes the Council. In winter it set watch before the doors of the poor Oriental bishops and obliged them

to shut their cells against brethren who came to visit them.
Thus it comes to pass

'that the word of two hundred Fathers of the ecumenical assembly always remains the word of the Pope alone. In fact, hitherto it is a thing unheard of that a single one of these prelates, sons of the Propaganda, should have the courage to speak before the Council or to vote otherwise than it would have them do. This single proof is of incomparable and demonstrative force, as against the reality of their freedom; for while all the other Churches, without exception, have had some independent voices, the Church which I shall call that of the Propaganda has not hitherto produced one.'

Proceeding to the most tender point of all, the writer says:—

'Above this *surreillance* of an institution the Jesuits have contrived another, which is shown more rarely, and is reserved for great events. This reaches the heads that are loftiest, even when they are held up, and it makes those who might feel a movement of independence tremble in spite of themselves. I mean the authority of Pius IX. Too long it has been sought to keep his action in the background, in the private history of the Council, by casting into the shade a figure which is entitled to stand in a strong light. Hitherto the writers of history have, at each new incident in the Council, been content to say, It is the work of the Roman Court. Well, the Roman Court is Pius IX., and history, when the hour comes, rending the covering of mystery, must let every one bear the responsibility which belongs to him. It will have to say that it is Pius IX. who would have the Council in spite of the Cardinals, and who now will have, in spite of them, his personal infallibility. It is he who required for the Council this hall where one cannot hear; it is he who became irritated with Audu and tore from him the abdication of his rights; it is he who refused to receive the petition of the minority requesting that unhappy debates should be averted; it is he who violated all rule in bringing on the burning question; it is he who suddenly smothered discussion when it became menacing for his pretensions; it is he who from the clergy of Rome required an address which they had at first refused; it is he who dismissed Theiner to reward Cardoni; it is he who by a classification to be much regretted distressed the prelates who on the anniversary day of his election came to congratulate him; it is he who called Guidi after his speech to subdue his independent spirit; it is he who from the Council demands either his personal infallibility or else the courage to die from the heat of the sun and of the fever; it is he who will be everything, both the universal faith and tradition—*La tradizione son io!* Never was absolutism seen so near at

hand, in an institution which Jesus Christ had founded free and independent in spite of its monarchical and indivisible unity.'

The aspect of the case which most distressed the writer seemed to be that studied humiliation of the bishops which marked the whole procedure of the Pope, and especially that raising against them of their own subordinates which bishops probably thought was a measure reserved only for employment against civil rulers, not against 'Venerable Brethren.' Contrasting the present excesses with those of the Popes of the middle ages, the writer proceeds:—

'At present we stand in presence of the Papacy struggling, not against princes, but against the episcopacy; as if Pius IX. could find on the ruin of his brethren a more elevated throne, or in their annihilation a more impregnable fortress. O misfortune of the times and abuse of the most holy institutions! They want to have only a single real bishop in the world—the Pope; a single infallible and authorised doctor—the Pope! Let every voice be silent unless to say what he has said; let no action be performed but under his episcopal jurisdiction—universal, immediate; let those who have been appointed by God to govern, renounce their imprescriptible rights; let them tear the pages of the gospel on which those rights are graven; we do not any longer want more than one mouth, one hand, an absolute monarch; then, say they, only then, shall we have universal order. . . . At present the Cæsars disappear everywhere and visibly; in vain do I look for a Louis XIV. or a Joseph II.; governments are essentially transformed and are confounded with the country which at least has no courtiers. There now remains in reality but one Cæsar, who is himself everything both in spiritual matters and in temporal, dispensing his favours to those who defend him, and making those who contradict him feel his wrath; and this Cæsar is not called either Francis Joseph or Napoleon III.'

'And while this time all temporal powers have scrupulously respected the liberty of the Council, a single one has hampered it in every way, has dreaded and destroyed it. I need not name the one. Thus the Church which had furnished to modern civil societies the model of a monarchy, in which the aristocratic and popular elements effectually tempered the excess of the supreme power, the Church which had first of all given to the modern world the example of its great assemblies, discussing in freedom the rights of truth and justice,—this Church presents to us to-day the spectacle of a Council without liberty and the menace of an absolutism without control.'

This will suffice to account for the displeasure of the Pope

and the Jesuits; but whether it sufficed to warrant the action of the Council and its language, posterity will judge. In our climate the allusion to the cruelty of keeping the old men in Rome in what is there called 'the severest season,' would seem overstrained. But the danger of attending a conclave in that season will be found described by Mr. T. A. Trollope as greater than that of a soldier on the field of battle. And his details of a conclave held in July to elect the Barberini Pope, gives frightful corroboration of that serious statement.¹ As M. Veuillot, looking from the point of view of the initiated, had at once leaped to the conclusion of the Pope only; and as Vitelleschi, reasoning from the data furnished by the Canons presented to the Council, inferred that all that would remain of earthly authority would be the Pope only; so this writer, starting from the episcopal point of view, and with difficulty rising above it, at last stands face to face with the sole figure of authority left, the Pope only; and he finds that while the spirit of Christianity has been changing Cæsars into mild and patriotic princes, another spirit has changed the Bishop of Rome into a Cæsar, claiming all supremacy in things temporal and spiritual.

CHAPTER IX.

From the Great Session to the Suspension of the Council, October 20th, 1870—
The Time now come for the Fulfilment of Promises—Position and Prospects
—Second Empire and Papacy fall together—Style of Address to the Pope
—War for the Papal Empire foreshadowed—Latest Act of the Council—
Italy moves on Rome—Capture of the City—Suspension of the Council—
Attitude of the Church changed—Last Events of 1870.

THE reader may perhaps feel that we have now reached a point at which many prophecies await their fulfilment, and many calculations their test. The enthusiasts had, on religious grounds, foretold that the utterance of the 'creative word'

¹ *Papal Conclaves*, p. 312.

would be attended with portentous religious effects. A Baptism of Fire, a New Pentecost, a rapidly diffused reign of righteousness all the earth over, and other such expressions, intimated the marvels that were to inaugurate the fresh era. The calculating men had counted on the display of power and union, whereof the Papacy was made the centre, to produce a great impression upon princes and politicians; an impression to which they would, on the other hand, be predisposed by the fear of revolution.

Thus, when the consummation should be reached, and a ruler should be solemnly set up by the bishops of the whole Church before the kings of the earth, like, to use the favourite simile of the time, the Lord setting His King upon His holy hill of Sion; and when this king should be officially declared to have the government upon his shoulders, to be invested with all authority for the moral regulation of human affairs, they expected that the princes, bowing down, would accept him as their supreme judge and arbiter. Indeed, at one time, the confident talk, not merely of men among themselves, but of the publications most in the confidence of the guiding men, had been about laying down conditions to kings and governments on which they might hope to rule in peace. Hints had not been spared, that only two alternatives could be allowed to them—the acceptance of the new moral order on the one hand, or the loss of their places on the other.

The restoration of society to what was called the Catholic ideal, its reconstruction on the new divine basis, its deliverance from the chronic plagues which in modern times had wasted it, were at once to begin, and moral order was to smile where of late chaos had lowered. Already these theorists beheld society crying for the Pope as its saviour. That picture which we have seen drawn by the *Civilità*, of the beggar at Peter's feet, as representing Society at the feet of the Pope, whose word was to raise the beggar up, may now return to the mind of the reader as representing what ought, at this time, to

have taken place. Furthermore, during the days of preparation for the Council, and during its deliberations, only one among all the nations had been singled out for solemn blessing and glowing assurances that God would not forget her services to the Church. Italy had been warned and cursed. Austria and her new constitution had been formally condemned. Russia had been laid under every possible anathema. Spain, ever since her change of government, had shared the same condemnation. As to the heretical countries, they were generally left, without separate mention, in the depths to which their sins had sunk them. But the Ultramontane organs in Germany and France had marked Prussia out for signal detestation, and denounced the union of Germany under the leadership of Prussia for the relentless opposition of the Church of God. France alone was blessed with the withering benediction of the priest.

The hour had come that was to show how far the seers had read the future, and how far the calculators had reckoned well. So far as related to the great dogma, and the definition of it, all that had been designed was happily accomplished; indeed, more completely accomplished than had been proposed in any design avowed up to the eleventh hour. So far, therefore, both seers and calculators were justified. They had not seen a false vision, so long as they contemplated the dogmatic issue; nor had they reckoned without their host, so long as they had reckoned upon bishops, priests, and friars. Events were now to tell how far the transformation of Society into the accepted model, how far the homage of kings, how far the self-surrender of Parliaments, how far the submission of codes to be remodelled by the Church, and how far the general consent of the human race to be guided by him who claimed to hold the place of God among men, were to pass from the realm of hope into that of experience.

The progress of the Council, and of opinion contemporary with its sittings, had dissipated many illusions. Even the

bishops had to be conquered, and were not won. Europe had been awokened and had not been attached, but alienated. Great as the glories of the spectacles had confessedly been, and much as they dazzled spectators, they had not carried legislative effect, except where the artistic legerdemain had admitted of immediate application. The vote of the minority on July 13th was one symptom of failure. Their final record of dissent, put into the Pope's own hand, was a more serious symptom. Their flight from the last public session was more serious still. The absence of the representatives of the governments from that session was yet far more depressing. All, therefore, that was now to be hoped for from the Church was submission; and the very utmost that any calculating man dared to hope for from governments was endurance. The worst was that statesmen had learned much more than they were ever meant to learn, and had seen into matters a deal further than laymen ought to see. And so the first night of the new dispensation closed in under dull skies, both physically and morally.

When the Romans, always curious to see how facts can be dressed for appearance outside of the walls, looked to the *Giornale di Roma* for an account of the session, they found there that all the bishops who had not appeared—nearly two hundred—were placed in one class, ‘absent from different legitimate and recognised reasons.’ This was followed by the assertion that ‘the great majority of them held the same doctrine as that which had been defined.’ Accustomed as the Romans are to this method of putting facts in vestments, the occasion was solemn before God and exposed to the eye of man. Vitelleschi wrote that in these representations the minority might find ‘a foretaste of the false statements and judgments they must in future expect.’ Some readily account for such assertions by saying that it was hoped that the documents which proved the contrary would never come to light. But much is due to the habit of reckoning on the power of a great organ to set officials upon repeating what it says, till the facts

are forgotten. The *Civiltà* copied these statements, and yet at a later date gave a truer account of the abstentions.

It said :—Cardinals, 42 *pro* and 4 *contra*; Patriarchs, 6 *pro* and 2 *contra*; Primates, 6 *pro* and 2 *contra*; Archbishops, 80 *pro* and 18 *contra*; Bishops, 349 *pro* and 47 *contra*; Abbots and Generals, 40 *pro* and only 1, a Chaldean, *contra*. The same article, however, does not shrink from asserting that ‘many’ of the minority voted *Placet* in the public session.

The heaviest solicitudes of the Curia were now to begin. They had plucked their fruit, which certain promises had said would make them like gods, ruling over mortals; and now they were soon to tremble, and to feel themselves stripped bare. Events had been so guided that so long as they were dealing with their own instruments, the bishops and the clergy, they were left completely to effect their purpose. Now came the point where they were to operate upon mankind. That society which they had meant completely to subjugate, flattering themselves that they were about to restore it, was now placed face to face with them in an awful aspect, one which neither priests nor kings could fully interpret. Certain it was, however, that neither kings nor ‘peoples’ were upon their knees before the Vicar of God, or were inclined to go down upon them. Some feared that instead of kings and nations appealing to him to save them, he would soon be found appealing to some one to save him. The fortunes of the restored empire of the Bonapartes, and those of the restored Papacy, had been bound up together. Men now watched and whispered, saying that as they had been strangely united in their lives, perhaps they would not be divided in their fall. The 13th of July, the day of the voting which gave the Pope his fatal majority, was the day of the incident at Ems. It was the day also on which the Duc de Gramont informed the French Chambers that, although the Hohenzollern candidate for the throne of Spain had been withdrawn, that did not close the dispute. The 18th of July, the day on which the Pope read out by candle-light the Decree

upon his own infallibility, was the day on which Napoleon despatched his fatal declaration of war to Berlin. A baptism of fire had been often and pompously foretold as the result of the great dogma. After its promulgation all that the world ever heard of a baptism of fire was when Napoleon telegraphed to the Empress, whom the devout regarded as the true author of the war, telling her, in loud brag before the nations, how her boy had received his baptism of fire. That again was but two days before simultaneous sorrows sounded the knell of the empire and of the throne which sheltered under the shadow of its wing—the two embodiments of arbitrary will calling itself authority.

On the 4th of August the Pope was chafing at the news that the French troops at Civitá Vecchia had actually commenced embarkation. On the same day Bonaparte read the telegram from Wissenberg. On the 6th of August Count Arnim on the Capitoline was writing to Berlin to tell his government that Napoleon had declined an offer of the Pope to mediate between the belligerents, assigning as the ground that after the declaration of war negotiations were too late. That same day came upon Napoleon the double disasters of Wörth and Spichern. The reply of the King of Prussia to the same offer of mediation on the part of the Pope was to the effect that if the Pontiff would procure for him assurances of the pacific intentions of Napoleon, and guarantees against similar violations of the peace in the future, he would not refuse to receive them from the hands of his Holiness.¹ The total result then of the first attempt at political action abroad, in the new character, was a simple failure. At the same time political embarrassments at home were thickening, as they had done every day since the fatal 13th of July.

It was after Rome had learned that the sun of Austerlitz had not shone on the fields of Wörth and Spichern, that the first formal act occurred showing that the Council had neither been

¹ *Civiltá*, VII., xi., 760.

W. A. M. L. C. S.

dissolved nor prorogued. All that the Pope had done was to give the bishops a general leave until November 11th. Had everything gone smoothly, this arrangement would have enabled the men of the Curia to go on as if they were a General Council. The step to which we allude was merely the formal addition of certain names to the Committee on Church Discipline, to replace those who had left Rome. And this is registered on the 13th of August.

Meantime an intimation was given of the style of adhesion to the Papacy in its renewed glory which would be acceptable at the Vatican. The *Civiltà* selected for publication, 'by preference,' as it expresses it, an address from the Society of Catholic Youth in Bologna. This address had the double advantage of expressing right views in fitting language and of coming from the young, on whom all the hopes of the future era were constantly declared to depend. It stated that, as if in recompense of the new and lofty honour to the Virgin Mary procured by the word of Pius IX., Divine Providence had exalted in his person the divine dignity of the successor of Peter to the summit of glory and power :—

'We shall ever keep our eyes fixed on Thee, the mirror of eternal Truth. We shall ever keep them directed to this Apostolical Chair, whence the waters of true wisdom and of eternal life perennially flow. Speak, then, O Infallible Teacher, and we, the youthful sons of the Catholic Church, will hear Your words as the words of eternal wisdom ; Your judgment shall be for us the judgment of God ; Your definition shall be as the definitions of God ; Your instruction as the instruction of God. In your authority as Vicar of Christ we venerate the authority of God, and submitting our mind and our heart to that authority, we have faith to sustain the dignity of human nature in face of the pretentious tyranny of haughty intellect spoiled and blinded by guilty passions.'

The historical tales which had for years been carried on in the pages of the *Civiltà* under the title *The Crusaders of St. Peter*, from which we have occasionally given scenes, rather strangely happened, in the number of the *Civiltà* for August the 24th, to come to an end. It concluded with the

¹ *Civiltà*, VII., xi., 481-2.

list of the immortal dead, as recorded for the world in a monument which Italy may well preserve. The Pope did not know what a record of the exotic character of his own power he was putting up. The ideal of this monument, and of the methods by which the world was to be made Catholic, is given by the *Civiltà* in a very few words :—

'It was the conception of Pius IX. that, in the Agro Verano, on soil consecrated by the tombs of the ancient martyrs, should arise the memorial of the crusaders of the nineteenth century. And another conception of Pius IX. was the colossal group in marble which represents St. Peter in the attitude of committing the sword to a warrior in armour, who with the cross bears a flag, with the legend, *The Catholic World*. Peter is Pius; the warrior is the Christian army. The idea of the mission of that army glows in the authoritative action of him who gives the commission, and in the humble and generous action of him who receives the commission, and is admirably expressed in two texts of Scripture beneath, drawn from the Book of the Maccabees, "Take this holy sword, a gift from God, wherewith thou shalt overthrow the adversaries of my people Israel. . . . For victory standeth not in the multitude of the army, but strength cometh from heaven."

The names of the martyrs of this crusade are given, and among those who fell in the Battle of Mentana is only one Italian. France, Belgium, Holland, England, Ireland, and Germany are all represented, and Switzerland still more strongly. In the other most considerable engagement, that of Monte Libretti, there is again but a single Italian. Among those who perished by being blown up in barracks in Rome were several Italians, in large part musicians. That record is certainly worth the keeping of Italy at any cost, and the setting of it up is only one of the manifold evidences of how blinded the Papacy was in the last days of its temporal power.¹ Well might the Pope in the *Syllabus* condemn the doctrine of non-intervention.

On the 15th of August a great 'function' was celebrated at Rome, in the Church of St. Louis of the French, in commemoration of the name-day of the Emperor Napoleon—that modern

¹ *Civiltà*, VII., xi., 559 ff.

Charlemagne who restored the Roman Catholic Church in France, and whose nephew restored the Pope to his holy city. Cardinal Bonaparte, the Marquis de Banneville, and all the French notables attended in state. About the same time a sorely smitten man, accompanied by his boy, was crossing the drawbridges of Metz, turning their faces to the rear, amid gibes and nicknames from the French soldiery. While winding up the heights of orchard and of vineyard which overhang the beauteous dale of the Moselle, and when looking on the fair uplands of Lorraine, upon which were sleeping, in happy obscurity, villages like St. Privat and Gravelotte, like Rezonville and Mars La Tour, the withered Emperor and his yet unripe son might see French soldiers marching in retreat, but could not see the Germans by whom they were being already outmarched. Meanwhile in Paris the two elect ladies of the Golden Rose—Isabella and Eugénie—were spectators, the first sighing after a crown already lost, the second trembling for a regency attained as if only to expedite the breaking of the sceptre of her husband. Had either of them faith enough to believe that the Virgin could reward them for services done to the Holy Father by giving them the necks of their enemies? Our Lady of Victories, ‘terrible as an army with banners,’ to quote a favourite text with Jesuit writers, was propitiated at least by the Empress Regent.

So far the political calculations of the Curia had all been turned to vanity. Bavaria had not fraternised with the French, much less carried Würtemburg and Baden with her. The blast of invasion which was to sound the death-knell of German unity had proved to be its mustering-cry. Italy up to the present moment had stood in awe of France, but if the latter should receive another blow or two, matters might reach a pass at which the Italian government would have more cause to fear Garibaldi than Napoleon—and then?

News soon arrived that the Germans, out-marching the French, had met them in the villages which we have lately men-

tioned, the names of which were by that meeting written large on the memory of nations. The poor Pope saw that Bonaparte, whom he had used and hated, was not likely to retain power any longer to guard his temporal throne. He knew that Italy was wiser than the first Bonaparte, who taught the French that the Pope was to be treated as if he had two hundred thousand bayonets,—a lesson that has cost them dear. Italy adopted the principle that, in respect of bayonets, the Pope was to be counted as worth just as many as he could command. Perhaps, when it comes to a question of bayonets, that is the right way of counting. Italy would also treat him more wisely as a teacher. She would not incarcerate, exile, or personally insult him, but would leave him free to bless or curse as he felt moved, and to be heeded or disregarded according as every man felt persuaded in his own mind.

It was with hearts weighted with the heavy news from the banks of the Moselle that the Fathers of the Council met in their Congregation on the 23rd of August. How changed that gathering from the proud assembly of last December, which challenged the homage of all kings, and at the sight of which the Margottis and the Veuillots spoke of our Parliaments as puppet-shows! So long as you looked to dress, and processions, and sounding titles, and inflated claims, the comparison was all in favour of the parliament of priests. But now those whose organs of the press a few months before wrote as if neither kings nor presidents had any long tenure of power, except as they might make their peace with the Church, felt themselves to sit amid the indifference of mankind, and under the menacing strokes of Providence. The bishops who had warned them of their ignorance and folly, but had been crushed, were now far away, many of them destined to reap bitter fruit. In the Congregation, the Fathers discussed some matters of Church discipline, but as the shadow of Sadowa had arrested all preparations for the Council during fourteen months, and that of Garibaldi for three or four, now a darker

shadow, projected from Wörth and Gravelotte, was falling upon the remaining ecclesiastics, as the evening gloom of the Aventine falls on late gamblers in what was once the Circus Maximus. They had played for the certainty of the temporal power, and for the reversion of the lordship of the world. They had boldly staked all episcopal and clerical rights. The upshot was that the losers had lost, and that the one winner was to be a loser too. The next news showed them that, on the very day when they thus met, was completed the investment of Metz. Thus did they see the thrice beaten but still coherent army of Bazaine altogether cut off from the routed and disorganised army of MacMahon. They had fixed to meet again on the 1st of September.

The Fathers probably felt that it was doubtful whether the Congregation fixed for the 1st of September would meet ; but it was highly politic to keep up the airs of a General Council, because it increased the sanctity of the city, and made it morally more difficult for Italy to attack. Ere they met, it became known that at Beaumont, Failly—the faithful General Failly, the leader of the expedition of Mentana, lauded and blessed for his ‘prodigious chassepots’—had met the Bavarians, soldiers of that king whom the *Unità* never wearied of insulting, and that at their hands Failly had lost his guns, his baggage, and his camp, a large part of his men, and all his reputation. The Congregation of the 1st of September did meet, and it was the last. While Bishop Quinn, of Brisbane, in Australia, was offering up the Mass, the undulating plateaux around Sedan were reeking with an incense which had, within the last few years, been invoked with lamentable frequency by the organs of the Vatican. As the Fathers were rising from their afternoon siesta, tens of thousands of blue and grey eyes, from all the heights commanding the city of Turenne, began to dance for joy at seeing the white flag waving from the old castle lying low down in the hollow,—ay, the white flag waving over the Imperial head of him who to them represented the traditional devastators of the German Fatherland, but who was, to the bishops of the Council, the

prince who for twenty years had been the stay of the temporal power.

No sooner had the news from Sedan reached the Agro Romano, than Curia and peasant alike knew all that was to follow. One week after that day the Fathers gathered, on the 8th of September, for the last great ceremony, or, as it was called, 'the last extra conciliar act.'¹ The remains of the world-transforming host of December now speckled the noble Piazza del Popolo, pressing to the great church of Santa Maria. It was the Festival of the Nativity of the Virgin. All that the *Civiltà* tells of the day is that there were great expectations, and that the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, then three months distant, would witness a splendid session. We should say that there was no expectation of the sort, except indeed among the few who really counted on the Virgin as being certain at last to work for the Pope the miracles which it had been so often suggested that she was in gratitude bound to perform. The majority calculated that she had acquitted all her debts to him by making him infallible. Desirable as it was to keep up the appearance that Rome was just then the seat of a General Council, they knew that though for us and other remote people beyond the mountains that might have a sacred sound, for the Italians it was not a name to conjure with.

On the very day when the Fathers were cheerlessly performing this final ceremony, a notification was sent forward by Victor Emmanuel that he was unable longer to stay the impetus of the nation, which panted to take possession of its capital. The letter of the king was weak and disingenuous. It was more like the work of a priest than of a soldier. He affected to be a good Catholic, while deliberately dethroning the Vicar of God. He affected to hope that the Pope would acquiesce in his own dethronement. The reply of the Pontiff was more worthy of his position, and more becoming his professions.

This hostile movement called out a quality in which Popes

¹ *Civiltà*, VIII., i., 66.

are surely infallible, that of appealing to foreigners for armed intervention against their own countrymen. Of all men, to whom should the Pope now turn but to the King of Prussia,—as if the King of Prussia did not know at what the Pope and his instruments had been aiming! The date of the reply of King William was in itself a history. He wrote from the capital of fair Champagne. Already had the tide of war closed round the hot infallibilist Räss in his stately Cathedral of Strasburg; and, rolling on, it had, under the shadow of St. Remy, enveloped the deserter from the Opposition, Landriot, in his thrice beautiful fane at Rheims. It was rushing forward with impartial force to surround Meignan the oppositionist at Chalons, and even the two prelates at Paris and Versailles who had stood with the extremes of the two contending parties.

St. Remy sent no sufficing homage by the hand of King William. The soldier-king quietly declined to undertake any such political intervention as the priest-king desired. In one word, he dispelled the idea of the venerable applicant, that the cause of Prussia was implicated. The matter, said King William, is one 'which does not, as your Holiness appears to think, in any way affect the interests of Prussia.' That calm word would provoke many a vow to make the heretic feel that the Pope could affect the temper of millions of his subjects, and therefore the interests of his government.

Yet one week from the notification of Victor Emmanuel, and on the 15th of September, rode up an Italian staff officer, with all the forms of war, to the Milvian Bridge,—that *Pons Milvius* ever memorable for the victory of Constantine and the death of Maxentius. The latest addition to its history of military incidents, which began with the conspiracy of Catiline, had been made one-and-twenty years previously, when the insurgent Romans defeated an attempt to carry the bridge made by the French under Oudinot. The point of meeting did not, therefore, seem to be one of good omen for Pius IX. The Italian officer was Colonel Count Caccialupi, or Chase-the-Wolves. He came

from General Cadorna to demand, in the name of the King of Italy, the surrender of the city. On behalf of his Holiness, General Kanzler at once gave his reply. The place was to be defended. General Bixio on that day closed in upon Civitá Vecchia.

Meanwhile, Count Arnim, in the hope of averting bloodshed, plied between the city and the Italian camp. The Pope, however, was resolved upon resistance. He did, indeed, give orders that it should be continued only so long as to compel the Italians to open a breach, in order, as he said, to attest the fact that his capital fell by violence. That end, we might have thought, would have been equally well answered, without bloodshed, by surrendering after the first gun. The forces of the Pope numbered eight thousand, and those of Cadorna fifty thousand. Rapidly as the temporal power and the Second Empire were both rushing downhill, it appeared as if they were constantly to keep step. So did it fall out that on that very 19th of September when the Prussians, defeating Vinoy, closed round Paris, Cadorna, coming up from the north, sat down before the gates of Rome. His lines stretched from the Salara Gate to the Gate of San Giovanni, thus enclosing that cemetery of St. Lorenzo, where stood the monument to the Crusaders, with so many foreign and so few Italian names. Coming up from the south, General Angiolotti stretched from the Gate of St. Giovanni to that of St. Sebastiano. Early the next morning Bixio, coming up from Civitá Vecchia, which he had captured, took post before the Gate of San Pancrazio, remembered for the contest between Garibaldi and the French.

With the first light of the 20th of September did the chambers of the Vatican begin to rattle with the sound of other artillery than the joy-guns of St. Angelo. The last time that sound had disturbed those vaults was when it came as the voice of a French republic, commanding a Roman republic to make way for the most despotic rule in Europe. Now France was learning for herself what it is to hear the guns of the stranger

before the gates of the capital ; and Rome was feeling what it is to hear the voice of the Fatherland bidding the stranger depart. Of the two potentates who in 1849 thundered at the weak walls of poor old Rome, he who then acted the restorer was now an exile and a captive, while he who was then an exile panting for return, now sat in the halls to which he was then restored, but sat feeling in the thud of every gun that even within those halls he too would soon call himself a captive.

While the din pained the spirit of the aged Pio Nono, forty of the Italians attacking and twenty of the foreigners defending were killed, and a hundred and fifty of the assailants and fifty of the garrison were wounded. Reports came that the heaviest fire was directed against the Porta Pia, the gate particularly connected by name with his own name, adorned and restored by his liberality, and endeared to his military recollections by the triumphal entrance of his crusaders from Mentana less than three years before. A letter is published in which the Pope ordered General Kanzler to surrender as soon as a breach should be made. But it would not appear that he had really granted him power to do so ; for the *Civiltá* expressly says that the order to hoist the white flag was given by the Pope himself, and accounts for needless bloodshed by the delay which occurred ere that order could reach the gate that was beleaguered.¹

Some five hours had passed since the horrid din began. No Michael with his legions of angels, no Madonna terrible as an army with banners, smote the host of the aliens. No Peter struck the barbarians with blindness. No Dominic, with a cohort of sainted Inquisitors; no Ignatius, with a celestial 'Company,' flashed death upon the worse than Moslems who fought for uprisen Italy. All these things had been expected. They came not, but instead of them came the news that a breach at the Porta Pia invited the Italians in. At last the poor old priest-king made up his mind to stay the futile flow

¹ VIII, i, 108.

of blood. He knew the temper of his zouaves. They would have stood and died like crusaders; but at last the word was given. Then upon the heights of the Janiculum, whence they were bombarding the Gate of St. Pancrazio, began the dark and fiery eyes of Bixio's Italians to dance, as twenty days before, at Sedan, had danced the eyes of King William's Germans. There, yea, there on the dome of proud St. Peter's, being raised and beginning to flutter, was the white flag, and there unwinding itself did it float out upon the September breeze, and waved in the forenoon sun,—waved over Pontiff and Cardinal, over the Circus of Nero and the Inquisition of the Popes. Was it real? Eyes would be wiped to see if they did not deceive. Eyes, ay, the eyes of soldiers, would be wiped from thick, hot tears. Could it be—could it ever be? Come at last! The hour for which ages had impatiently waited, for which myriads of Italians had died. Italy one! her arms outstretched from Etna and from Monte Rosa, clasping at last every one of her children, and even availing by their returning strength to lift up her poor old Rome from under the load of the priest and the stranger.

He who two brief months before had, amid deep darkness at noonday, read out, by artificial light, the Decree of his own unlimited power and irreformable law, lay down that night amid a rude and intrusive glare streaming from across the Tiber into the multitudinous windows of the Vatican. It came from the lights of Rome all ablaze with illuminations for the fall of the temporal power. In the piazza below lay the Pope's little army of foreigners, passing their last night in the Holy City under shade of the basilica in which they had consecrated their bayonets to St. Peter, and within embrace of the two arms of the glorious crescent colonnade. For true it is that stone cupolas, and stone columns, put up by the distant dead, may be of real avail as stays of a power after the hearts and hands of willing men have ceased to hold it up. The soldiers passed the next morning in confused preparations for a departure. At noon a

cannon was fired, and the Pope appeared on his balcony. Looking down on his defenders, he was doubtless reminded of the proud day, after the return from Gaeta, when he blessed the then triumphant French. Now he could not conceal his overpowering emotion. With the retreating steps of these prisoners of war, were about to vanish mystic visions of martial feats crowned by divine miracle. The soldiers raised their old cry, *Viva Pio Nono*, in loud and ringing tones; which, smiting against the basilica and the palace, were from thence rolled back, and flew across the stream, till the sound of *Viva Pio Nono* once more floated along the neighbouring streets of the capital. Uprisen Italy, quietly sustaining her uplifted Rome, hearkened in silence to the foreign cheer. Then, for the last time, did the Pope give to his beloved soldiers what they had so often received, his benediction. As he withdrew, when the corridors opened lone and long before him, when the doors closed behind, cutting him off from the only bayonets on which he could rely, no wonder if he felt that the palace of the Pontiffs had become a prison.

The crusaders, turning to the left, passed out of the Gate Angelica ; then winding round under the windows of the Vatican, close by the garden walls, and along the Janiculum, they finally reached the Gate of San Pancrazio, where Cadorna and his staff awaited them to receive the formal surrender. Proud were the men under the red, white, and green, with the cross of Savoy, as they saw the head of the approaching column. As the first men of the French legion came up they insulted the Italian staff. According to the *Civiltà*, Bixio was so incensed that he reproached Cadorna for having conceded to such troops the honours of war. The friendly writer extenuates their misconduct by alleging the irritation caused by affronts received from the rabble in the streets on the previous day. But when the zouaves came up led by the brave Colonel Charette, they behaved like soldiers (*Civiltà*, VIII., i., 212).

When the crusaders of Pio Nono passed away from the

Gate of San Pancrazio, who would have dared to say that the sixty dead and the two hundred wounded of the day before were to be the last victims of war provoked by Popes abusing the name of the Prince of Peace? And who would not feel for the French crusaders, who, led by their priests, and thinking that they did God service, had for twenty years inflicted upon Italy, at the behest of the Pope, the miseries of foreign occupation, and now, in facing their own fair land, were to behold the foreigner seated in her proudest palaces.

From that day forth, when the Roman met the priest on the street, he felt that he was no longer bound, except at the dictate of his own conscience, to confess to him his sins ; that, indeed, he was not even bound to purchase an Easter ticket, to be produced as evidence that he had duly presented himself in a tribunal in which, in fact, he had never set foot. From that day forth, when the friar entered the church of St. Ignatius, neither the great picture of the torments of the heretics, nor what, in his dialect, he might call the ‘divine’ *lapis lazuli*, retained all its old brilliancy; for within those sacred walls the internal tribunal of the kingdom of God was no longer anything more than a voluntary confessional. From that day forth disappeared from the seats of justice on the Seven Hills the ecclesiastical magistrate, and with him the external tribunal of the Church. From that day forth appeared for the first time for long and weary ages, the civil magistrates, sitting in open court under the eye of all, to administer, with whatever shortcomings, a law which accepted the Christian principle of even-handed justice to Jew and Gentile ; to those who said, We are of Cephas, and to those who only said, We are of Christ. In the eye of the Vatican this was the fall of the supernatural order, the godless triumph of naturalism ; but in other eyes it was the substitution of God’s good ordinance for the contrivance of priesthood, which, conscious that it was not natural, called itself supernatural. From that day forth the Roman noble ceased to be a mere title-bearer and jewel-stand, for now a

career in the government of his country opened before him. Now, for the first time since the so-called Christian priest—but let all men know that Christianity speaks not of any priest but ONE, her sole High Priest in heaven—for the first time since the so-called Christian priest extinguished prince and senator under the robes of the Pontiff, was the Roman noble a member of a real aristocracy,—not, indeed, an aristocracy privileged as ours, but, on the other hand, one which was not shut off by a sacred caste from public life, one having every prize open, and, in each separate race of the arena, having the unmeasured advantages of name. From that time forth the people ceased to be a mere populace, and entered on the dignities of a democracy. Law, letters, science, politics, diplomacy, and oratory now called upon the bright-browed child of the working man to come and grace them with his gifts, and not to sit doomed to the destiny of the incapable, unless he would put on the frock of the priest. From that day forth the double office of Despot-Pontiff, answering to the ideal of later Pagan Rome, was replaced by the mild office of the monarch, reigning at the head of an aristocracy and a democracy, both invested with natural rights, both curbed by moderating powers,—a monarchy which represents the Christian ideal of a Great Father who in action is the depositary of the collective fatherly authority of the households of the nation, and in council the head, but only the head, of their collective wisdom. The priest as a teacher of doctrines; as a celebrant of rites, or as a practitioner of charms, remained as free as ever he had been before; but as a power to impose himself upon all, and as exclusive king of men, his reign had passed away. Italy said, ‘For ever’; the priest replied, ‘Only for a very little time’!

On the 2nd of October the Italian government took a plebiscite in the Roman States, to enable the people by a vote to record their own desire as to whether they would belong to the kingdom of Italy or to the Spiritual State. According to the

Civiltà, the voting in the Holy City was 40,835 in favour of Italy, and 46 against. It must not be imagined that the total amount of dissent was represented by the 46. The partisans of the supernatural order generally abstained; but probably they would have done otherwise had they not known that, even if they all mustered, the majority would be overwhelming. They, as usual, cried out against bribery, coercion, and similar wrongs. Indeed, to read the Papal organs at this day, one might believe that ever since the national movement began, every vote and every battle has been carried against the preponderating mass of Italians by some few Freemasons, Jews, and invisible conspirators.

The Council which was to restore all things still sat. Not even a prorogation had taken place. Now, however, the Pontiff, though not intending to dissolve it, determined to suspend it until a happier time. Exactly a month after Rome had passed into the hands of Italy, appeared on the 20th October the Act by which the Council was suspended. In the Bull of Convocation the Pope had spoken of his intentions for the general benefit of society. In the Bull of Suspension it appeared that the particular society which best knew him and his remedies had spewed them out of her mouth. After having for many centuries had experience of his spiritual supremacy and temporal power, Italy had mournful proofs that they were socially evil. No land in Europe could produce a record of any dynasty which had so often brought into it foreign armies, to beat its people down, and to keep them under. No land in Europe could, from times within the memory of living men, produce such lists of the executed, the exiled, the imprisoned, and of those submitted to torture. No land in Europe had a ruling class among members of which public justice, when once free, had, week after week, to deal with such vile immoralities as the Courts of Italy had to punish in members of the priesthood. Italy had made the last trial of priestly rule with a prince personally free from the social blots

which in the case of many of his predecessors had complicated questions of the public weal with questions of personal vice. Under Pius IX. the system stood out more fairly to be judged by its principles and by its fruits. And under Pius IX. Italy had rung with accounts of moral wrongs, of crimes of power, of curses uttered by the subject, such as had long since ceased to be heard of in other countries of Europe free from Turkish rule. Greatly as the influence of the priesthood had demoralised Italy, and had obscured the general conscience, there was still a high sense of the superiority of ordinary public life, compared with such a public life as existed among and under a caste of celibate fathers and secular ecclesiastics. There was still sufficient conscience left to condemn them and their rule as socially intolerable. The monstrosity that called itself a Spiritual State, and sneered at Lay States, was carnal, and vile to the core. The wave which, as soon as the breakwater of the Second Empire had been removed, rolled in at the Porta Pia, was even more a wave of moral scorn and of social execration than of political hostility.

We saw, when the Bull of Convocation was issued, that to Professor Massi, the official biographer of Pius IX., the glory of the enterprise therein announced seemed to be so overwhelming that when he recorded the event the pen fell from his hand. That Bull pointed to the benefits about to be conferred upon universal society by the Pontiff. The Council met amid florid promises that princes generally, at least Catholic ones, would accept the Vicar of God as their supreme judge, mingled with terrible citations of them all to appear before him, in order to find at one and the same time their correction and their deliverance in his infallible sentence. All this was uttered with the haughty spirit that goes before a fall. The fall after the haughtiness did not tarry, and was strikingly indicated by a phrase under the hand of the High Priest himself, in the Bull of Suspension:— ‘We have been brought into such a position as to be entirely

under a hostile dominion and power, God in His inscrutable judgments having so permitted it.' Society had already beheld its self-proffered saviour clinging to the skirts of Napoleon III., and then crying to King William to save him from his fellow-countrymen. Now the kings heard their self-proffered judge himself declare that by a judgment truly supreme the temporal power had fallen,—that power which he and all his bishops had separately and unitedly assured the Church was altogether necessary to the proper exercise of his office of universal bishop.

We heard the *Civiltá*, in September, foretell that when the 8th of December should come it would witness a splendid session. Now at last it came, a waymark noting the end of a very eventful year—eventful in the life of France, in the life of Italy, in the life of the German nation, and in that of the Papal Church. But the anniversary of the Immaculate, of the Syllabus, and of the opening of the Vatican Council, brought with it no splendid session. They who twelve months ago had met to sit in judgment on the nations were scattered, and were in various languages making strange explanations and dexterous appeals to allay the general disquiet relating to their political plans; and in doing so were creating in the minds of all who understood what they said, and who knew what they had done, an impossibility of ever hereafter trusting to representations of theirs. Meantime, without his seven hundred bishops, without his adoring crowds, without the glitter of fallen royalties and of quasi-civic dignitaries, without his beloved zouaves, yet still guarded by his stalwart and fantastic Swiss—for at that Court it is ever foreign steel that is true—the Pope, sitting in a palace of eleven thousand apartments, rich as any king, and free as any bishop in the world, yet felt and called himself a prisoner. Therefore when the day of exciting memories came, it was, says the *Civiltá*, spent in mourning and desolation. But a new offering to the Virgin was to raise the sacredness of the 8th of December,

even in this year of sorrow, to a higher pitch than ever. Hitherto the patron of the Holy Church had been St. Michael the Archangel, under whose spear the first rebel fell,—which rebel, as some time ago we saw, prefigured the latest rebel, Garibaldi. Indeed, after Mentana, St. Michael was, as military men say, ‘mentioned’ in the Court journal. For the *Civiltá*, in relating the overthrow of the Garibaldians, did not fail to note the fact that ‘it was on the day consecrated to the Prince of the Angelic Host, to the Patron of the Holy Church, St. Michael,’ that the invaders crossed the border. But now the Immaculate, who alone is terrible as an army with banners, who alone destroys all heresies, was to be further exalted, by the raising of her husband to that celestial dignity which had hitherto been borne by the great archangel. It was, say the reverend college of writers in the ruling periodical, a grand consolation that amid the mourning and desolation wherein the 8th of December was passed, the Decree proclaiming St. Joseph as the Patron of the Catholic Church was promulgated. They add that this Decree was issued to satisfy the Fathers of the Council, and that it might be considered as a firstfruit of devotion and piety reaped from the Council. The Italians said that St. Michael, as captain of the Lord’s host, had not in late years wielded the sword to the satisfaction of the authorities. Others said that the reason of the slight put upon him was simply that St. Joseph was the patron of the Company of Jesus. Others again looked no further for an explanation than to the fact that a form of religion which now—whatever was imagined and in theory professed—had in reality no standard of faith left but that of the *fait accompli*, would naturally seek change for the sake of rest.

Certain it is that from centre to circumference of the Papal orb, the devout were besieging the altars of those powers among whom Modern Rome distributes the affairs of that department which was by Ancient Rome assigned to Mars. In England, as the *Civiltá* proudly tells, was formed ‘The

Prayer League of our Lady of Victories, entirely composed of innocent children.' In Vienna the arch-confraternity of St. Michael called the citizens to a solemn novena, Belgium moved in a similar manner, and Spain on the 8th of December beheld the faithful thronging to the altars of Mary. 'Processions and pilgrimages' added a 'splendid' demonstration, in which Belgium, Germany, and the Tyrol merited particular mention. The tomb of St. Boniface was besieged with pilgrims, praying that the tomb of Peter might be redeemed from the hands of the Italian Islamite. And the tomb of Henry the Emperor Saint, 'fierce defender of the rights of the Holy See,' was so beset with pilgrims on the day two months after the commencement of the captivity, that the streets of Bamberg resounded with the suppliant song of *eighty-two* processions seeking to move the warrior saint. In Munich, after exhibiting in 'functions' within the Churches 'all that is grand in the Catholic cult,' the clergy, the archbishop, and the devout, in crowds said to comprise all Munich, paraded the streets chanting prayers for the ransom of the Pontiff. At Bamberg the sermon was preached by Canon Schmid, a member of Parliament, one of the many priest-members with whom German Parliaments are sanctified. A difference of tone as to the national sovereign and the general one appears to transpire in the simple expression that the thousands of Bavarians congregated around the tomb of the fighting St. Henry, 'sent a vigorous address to King Ludwig, and one of filial condolence to the Pontiff.' The true tone which becomes such addresses is indicated by pointing out the fact that the religious and scientific societies of Catholic youth in Sicily and Naples have for the motto of their head council the words, 'EVERYTHING FOR THE POPE AND FOR THE CHURCH.' These Italian youths are represented as being emulated by the English youth, the Portuguese, the Austrian, and the German.¹

If St. Michael had not retained his militant position, his

¹ *Civiltà*, VIII., i., pp. 44-61.

confraternity in Vienna, conscious of where lay the sinews of war, sent loads of Peter's Pence. So in point after point of Europe the vows and bonds assumed in favour of Peter's Pence by fresh associations from Holland to Portugal, and from England to Hungary, are recorded. In England it was to the ladies that the 'work' of raising Peter's Pence was assigned. The ladies of Vienna claimed it, the ladies of Madrid followed the example. And a valiant meeting in Belfast, and a meeting in Galway, resolved largely to swell the tide of Peter's Pence. The Catholic clubs joined in the movement, not only to console the Holy Father, but to condemn 'the guilty policy of spoliation.' Italy was grievously complained of for having dealt, by law, with certain Catholic Associations as political bodies, committing offences against the nation. But the great and splendid 'work' of the Pence of Peter is not enough. The meetings and manifestoes are equally necessary, and of the manifestoes the spirit is breathed in these words, addressed to governments : 'Do us justice ; or if not, to shake you out of your indifference, we shall avail ourselves of every means which the law allows.'

One brave claim of German Catholics is this : 'As loyal subjects we demand that our rights and our interests shall be protected even in the territories of the Church.' And politicians, *knowing these things*, will say and write that men moved from a foreign centre to make such claims of intervention on their governments are as good subjects as other men ! They well know that such an agitation raised in the midst of a mortal struggle, if it succeeds, plunges the nation into a second war ; and even if it does not succeed, diverts the nation from its own defence, and tends to divide it. But these German patriots say that they will embrace every opportunity that arises of pressing such rights as those above indicated upon their governments, by the press, by 'councils,' by meetings, and especially by sending men to Parliament who will have courage to take up the Catholic cause. The *Civiltà* characterises this language as the proclamation 'of a vigorous, a continued, and a legal struggle

against all governments which do not care for the cause of the Pontiff.' 'What the law allows,' would, in the mind of many a honest Catholic, mean the law of the land ; but on how many of such men could reliance be placed when, after all had been done which the law of the land allowed, they were instructed by sacred lips that when it contradicted the 'divine' law it ceased to be binding, and that then the law in the case was God's law, which was whatever the Church declared it to be ?

Geneva was made a chosen centre of activity, and the names of great and famous personages were paraded. While the ultimate ends to be aimed at were fitly expressed as 'reinstating the Holy Father in his temporal sovereignty, and re-establishing the social reign of the gospel,' the proximate ends, which in relation to the two great ones were but means, were, to move the heart of Christ to mercy by pilgrimages and prayers, to act upon governments, to excite opinion by the press, and to procure for the Pope means. It is not to be supposed that all the nobles and notables knew what was meant by 're-establishing the social reign of the Gospel.' Indeed, some of them would, doubtless, have interpreted it very loosely. But the leaders well knew its inmost meaning, and to them the shibboleths of the Syllabus were sacred, and the visions of the Church State universal were prophetic. Fifty meetings in the middle of December in the diocese of Fulda alone, while Germany was in the crisis of the war ; the object of those meetings being to plunge her into a war with Italy ! Indeed, it seemed to the *Civilità* as if, awoke from the slumber of ages by the prayers of the Catholics around his tomb, St. Boniface had gone out anew upon his apostolic pilgrimage, to rouse up the ancient devotion of the people to the Holy See.¹ Happy the land under whose sacred turf the saints are allowed to sleep, and are not disturbed in order to bear a part with any Saul against either the sons of the Philistine or the son of Jesse !

One new society which has not its name specified, is said to

¹ VIII., i, pp. 155-169.

be already a great one. It is composed of all who had borne arms in the crusade of Pius IX. From Holland to Marseilles, from Canada to the Tyrol, they had bound themselves together in a common bond. We are not left in doubt as to what that bond might be. Indeed, we are told that 'what it is cannot be obscure ; their former enterprise makes it clear.' To us the former enterprise would make the means clear,—namely, war ; but not so clear the end. They formerly warred to avert the fall of the temporal power. Were they now to go to war for the immediate and local object of 'reinstating the Holy Father,' and at the same time for the ulterior and world-conquering object of 're-establishing the social reign of the gospel ;' that is, of forming the world into Spiritual States, or at least into States under the spiritual reign of the clergy ? The object is prudently veiled in vague language, but language clear enough for the instructed ; 'full of warlike ardour in a meeting of Dutch and Belgians at Lovaine, they said that the aim of their union was to meet the future wants of the Church, was to conquer all the forces of impiety.'¹ But even in the language put into the lips of soldiers, and into the resolutions of public meetings, the object is never defined so as to limit it to restoring the temporal power, and generally a wide object beyond that narrow one is allowed to transpire. When old crusaders undertake with 'warlike ardour' to meet the future wants of the Church, we may divine of what kind her future wants are to be ; and when such men undertake to conquer all the forces of impiety, we may expect a social reign of the gospel, ushered in by the zouaves ;—such a social reign of it as some of the spiritual princes of the Continent re-established when, after their Spiritual States had been shaken by the Reformation, Catholic leagues reinstated the prince-bishops in power. As to England, the *Civilité*, at a date subsequent to notices already alluded to, names the Duke of Norfolk as heading a protest against the occupation of Rome from the

¹ *Civilité*, VIII., i., 293.

noblest of the nation ; Lord Campden and ‘Giorgio Clifford’ as leading a universal subscription of English youth ; the ladies as conducting the ‘work’ of Peter’s Pence ; R. Martin as forming a league of prayer for persons of all grades ; and Warteton (*sic*) as instituting ‘the crusade for Pius IX., a league of our Lady of Victories entirely composed of children.’¹ How many British children are learning in this much-mentioned league by the inspirations of our Lady of Victories, to covet their baptism of fire in the projected crusade, we do not know, nor yet how they are to be taught to select the particular branch of the ‘forces of impiety’ against which their first arms are to be proved. But, says the *Civiltá*—

‘there will be a struggle, there will be travails, there will be sorrows. But the victory is in their [the Catholics’] hands : of this the proof more than manifest is found in eighteen centuries of continuous combats and victories of Catholicism. As the great Matthias, indignant because before his eyes an officer of the king dared to burn incense to an idol, rose up crying, “Let him that is true to the law follow me,” and commenced those grand struggles and grand victories of the Maccabees which are known to all, so the most fervent Catholics, indignant and horrified at the capture of Rome, pointing out the Revolution, in the meetings at Fulda and at Malines, at Ghent and at Geneva, as the cause of so much evil, as the enemy of Christ and of His Vicar, cried, “Let all that are Catholics at heart rise up and follow us in the fight.” Their cry has been heard, and the general crusade is already begun.’²

The development of the *general crusade* has been slower than the seers in their many Maccabean visions saw ; but at the end of six years all the preparations for it are in progress, and the two-fold end is steadily kept in view : first, Rome is to receive back the Pope at the point of the bayonet ; and, secondly, the whole world is to accept ‘the social reign of the gospel’ at the point of the bayonet too, unless nations, being timely wise, bow the neck and lick the dust where marches the Vicar of God. So man proposes. But since the day in 1850 when, as we heard at the beginning, a ‘salutary conspiracy and a holy crusade’ were formally announced as the two things needful,

¹ VIII., i., p. 288.

² VIII., i., pp. 421, 422.

much that man astutely planned and firmly proposed has not come to pass according to man's design, but has been strangely turned to the purposes of a clearer wisdom, and a kinder will. Even the monument in the cemetery of St. Lorenzo to the Crusaders, which exhibits Peter, under the effigy of Pio Nono, giving the sword to the Christian army, and commanding it to make a Catholic world, now bears, in addition to its texts from the Maccabees, a fresh inscription : 'Ransomed Rome leaves to posterity, as a lasting sign of calamitous times, this monument, erected by the theocratic government to foreign mercenaries.'

On the last day of 1870—that year of which the echoes will sound all down the vale of time, repeating the cry, 'Man proposes but God disposes'—a strange sound was heard in Rome. Floods had brought sorrow into the city. Victor Emmanuel left Florence, and at four o'clock in the morning of December 31st, for the first time, as king in his capital, set foot in Rome. In its sovereigns the city was familiar with titles of Saints, of Great, of Holiness, and of Blessedness, and with ancient titles noting many a shade of skill and power. But there was a title which was not only unknown, but seemed alien to all the traditions that had gathered around the place from the days of Sulla and of Catiline till now. As the burly king, amid the frantic joy which had marked his brief visit, was about to enter the carriage to return, a little girl approached with a nosegay of fair flowers, and said : 'Take this, KING HONEST MAN ! '

If with the expiring hours of 1870 the reign of Craft died in Rome, and that of Honesty began, it would mark the mightiest of all the modern revolutions.

CHAPTER X.

How far has the Vatican Movement been a Success, and how far a Failure?—As to Measures of the Nature of Means a Success—As to Measures of the Nature of Ends hitherto a Failure—Testimony of Liberal Catholics to the one, and of Ultramontanes to the other—Apparatus of Means in Operation for the Ultimate End of Universal Dominion—Story of Scherr as an Example of the Minority—Different Classes of those who ‘Submit’—Condition and Prospects of the Two Powers in Italy—Proximate Ends at present aimed at—Control of Elections—Of the Press—Of Schools—Problem of France and Italy—Power of the Priests for Disturbance—Comparison between Catholic and Non-Catholic Nations for last Sixty Years—Are Priests capable of fomenting Anarchical Plots?—Hopes of Ultramontanes rest on France and England—The Former for Military Service, the Latter for Converts—This hope Illusory.

BEFORE allowing ourselves to form any opinion on the question how far the attempt to place all authorities under the Pontiff has been a failure and how far a success, it is necessary that, in our own thoughts, two classes of measures should be set well apart. If we look only at measures which the leaders of the movement regarded in the light of ends, it is easy to pronounce it an utter failure, as most Italians and many of other nations have done. If, on the other hand, we look only at measures which the leaders regarded in the light of means, it is easy to proclaim, as all the voices of the Vatican have proclaimed, that so far the movement has been a success, wondrous even to the point of being manifestly divine.

In most wars, and in all sieges, generals are liable to the reproach of failure up to within a short time of the decisive victory. Meanwhile, they may have perfectly accomplished the steps on which they looked as means adequate to their end. Even then the means may prove to be inadequate, or, still worse, they may render the end more difficult of attainment than it would have been had they never been set in motion.

We think it impossible to deny the complete success of the Vatican movement in perfecting the measures devised as means. Those Liberal Catholics who at present loudly pronounce the movement a failure, have only to read their own writings of

1869 and of the earlier months of 1870, to find that at that time certain advances in the policy of the Curia were described as unattainable. Those advances have been accomplished. As to certain measures, it was said that governments, bishops, clergy, people, would unite to make them impossible. Those measures are now statutes and ordinances. The Liberal Catholics, indeed, may pensively say that the gains of the Curia are the losses of the Church. That may be. Time will tell. The fact now to be registered is simply this: Certain changes were declared necessary, and at the same time sufficient for the attainment of the great end of universal domination. Those changes were pronounced to be revolutionary in the Church, dangerous to society, and, in fine, impossible. They were resisted, were urged on, and were triumphantly carried.

We also think it impossible to deny that up to the present time (1876) the movement, viewed in relation to ultimate ends, has been a complete failure. We do not say as much of proximate ends. As we have used the writings of Liberal Catholics to measure the success in regard to means, so would we use the writings of the Court party to measure the failure in regard to ends. It is already familiar to us that in those writings the moral renovations which were to attend the dawn of the new era, could not be indicated by any metaphor short of the primal burst of light on the horror of chaos. It was to be! So soon as the Lord should manifestly set His king upon His holy hill of Sion, all kings were to fall down before him, and his enemies were to lick the dust. Parliaments were to recognise their impotence and expire. Populations, suddenly illuminated, were to behold the saviour of society, and were lovingly to bow to his law. As to any possible opposition, it was described as the heathen raging,—as the people imagining a vain thing. It was only the kings of the earth setting themselves and the rulers taking counsel together against the Lord and against His anointed.

Now, in fulfilment of these promises, what has come to pass?

The Pope has fallen from his temporal throne. A long and bloody war, carried on with a view to place Don Carlos on the throne of Spain, has failed. Contrary to the fairest promise, hopes of placing the Count of Chambord on the throne of France have faded away. The tentative federation of Germany has been consolidated by an imperial crown, hereditary in the reigning house of Prussia. Austria has persisted in her anti-Catholic legislation, as it was called, and has extended it by abrogating the Concordat. Switzerland and Germany have both returned the attacks of the ecclesiastical power upon the civil power, by laws reasserting the national supremacy in every sphere of public life. Italy, in the act of overturning the temporal power, has completed her own unity. In the act of completing her own unity, she has, in the city of Rome, violated what the Pope calls Catholic unity, by admitting religious liberty within the sacred walls. In America no great State has modified its law in favour of the new theocracy. Several of the Catholic States have shown a consciousness of its aims, and jealousy of its accredited agents. In Canada, leading Liberal statesmen have clearly evinced a rising consciousness of what the Papacy is, and of what it aims at. The one ideal ruler of the Curia, the one set before the youth of nations as their model, Garcia Moreno, President of Ecuador, has fallen, openly assassinated in broad daylight. Thus, at the time when, according to his seers, the Pontiff was to survey a new cosmos rising out of the chaos of the Modern State, he, all round the horizon, beholds only confusion worse confounded. At his creative word the light did not break, but the darkness settled deeper, and the chaos began to bellow with noises nearer and deadlier than before. At his command the proud waves were not stayed, but, overturning his throne, they have now, for six years, been careering over the place which knows it no more. Not one nation has submitted its code to his revision. Not in one kingdom of the earth has a ruler been installed to reign under the laws of the Syllabus.

Does not this statement concede all that is claimed by those who say that the movement is a failure not redeemed by one success? What it does really concede is, that of the two ways, in one of which the ends aimed at were to be accomplished, the first has disappointed all hope. The ends proposed were so grand that only in one of two ways could they be realised; and whatever may be said of the enthusiasm of the projectors, it is not to be denied that they never lost sight of this fact, and never concealed it. The two ways were either such an intervention of Providence as would amount to a cosmopolitan miracle, or else the slow operation of means extending over ages. While the Pope and his more superstitious followers seemed to expect that the Virgin and the new-made saints would obtain miraculous transformations, the more calculating, even at moments when the flow of money and of friends seemed not only to exhilarate the Vatican, but to intoxicate it, did not fail to keep in view the fact that centuries might intervene—centuries marked by many a partial success and many a temporary discomfiture—between the day when the perfected machinery of means should be set in motion, and the day when the crowning victory should lead the head of the human species in triumph to the goal. The Jesuits are now entitled to point to that fact in bar of any premature exultation over their disappointment. At the same time, with all their power of simulating the joy of victory in defeat, they have been unable to prevent chagrin from tinging much of their later language. The great spectacle did not operate as a charm. The sublime revelation of a central authority for all human affairs did not subdue any wayward institutions. Providence put no seal on the deeds done. The replacing of St. Michael in his office of patron of the Church, was symptomatic of considerable dissatisfaction with the departmental divinities in general.

On the other hand, this complete failure of supernatural aid, or of any favouring current in public events, does not alter

the fact that a system of means contemplated and desired for ages, has at last been perfected, and that it is now over all the world being gradually brought into operation. The magnitude of the means indicates the universality of the ends. The fact that centuries upon centuries have elapsed since Popes began to claim what Pius IX. has now acquired, that more than three centuries have passed even since, at Trent, the Jesuit General set up the pretensions which have now, at last, become the law of one hundred and seventy millions, is a consideration not lightly to be set aside, particularly when we contemplate the strife for universal dominion now openly inaugurated as a continuing struggle, to be handed down from generation to generation of men trained and consecrated to this very thing.

The stupendous scope of the ends might well demand as means measures exceptionally great, and the magnitude of the measures already carried as means may now well excuse, if not justify, confidence that the ends after they shall have been steadily pursued for ages will also be attained. Those ends were not less, when united into one, than the dominion of the world. They would not be attained till the voice of the Church in her tribunals gave forth sentence of plenary authority on all affairs into which entered any moral element, whether those affairs were personal, social, national, or international.

The Internal Tribunal, seated in every church, in every palace, in every castle, and at need in every private chamber, would always in point of authority take precedence of any local law, and would rule bed, board, purse, family, and all action which conscience determines.

The External Tribunal, seated in every city, would maintain the headship of the bishop over the civil magistrate, and the supremacy of spiritual over civil law and authority, as sacredly as we should maintain the supremacy of our civil law and authority over military law and authority. We do not call the civil authority military, any more than Rome will call her spiritual authority temporal, but we make, as she does, the

higher order of authority include control over the affairs of the lower order. The External Tribunal would make the Internal an establishment of the law. Every man, every woman, ay, every child of a certain age, who should not appear at least once in the year in that tribunal, would run into a punishable offence.

The Supreme Tribunal in the person of the Pope, acting either directly or through any Court or Congregation he might appoint, would be the final bar at which would appear contending kings, contending nations, or other appellants whatever, as also all whom he might, for any cause, be pleased to cite. From that judgment-seat would fall the sentence that only the Almighty could challenge. According to the well-known formula, the Supreme Judge would carry all rights in the shrine of his own breast.

Such a universal dominion was the end, the ultimate end in view. The end was hallowed to the mind of those proposing it by the persuasion that this dominion of the priest of God is the veritable kingdom of Christ. It is only by realising how conscientious is this view of the spiritual empire, or the Roman Empire in a spiritual form,—a view which, founded on a historic ideal, fascinates the imagination of Romanists,—that we can either be just and charitable to the men who move for these ends, or can arrive at any reasonable estimate of the amount of future force in their movement of which such ideas are the motive power. Mere politicians, say some, who have no religious feeling! Yes, many such; but these politicians well know that their power is proportioned to the amount of religious feeling which they can create and make ready to be acted upon. It is by putting together the political skill of the one set of men and the religious feeling of the other, that we obtain means of judging as to the quality of the directing and the amount of the impelling forces to be developed in the future struggle.

Probably the Catholic party, in its estimate of both these

forces, falls into exaggeration. Probably the Liberals, in non-Catholic countries, fall into the opposite extreme. In our own country they certainly do so, and also in Italy. The Catholics feed their hope on the past fortunes of the Church. Here they wrong their own chances by the wrong they do to history. They monstrously distort facts even in particulars, but when they come to generalisations they simply build castles in the air for the future, under colour of summing up the past. Notwithstanding all this, enough of reality appears in their catalogues of past triumphs to give to hope that glow which suffices to inspire struggles even when it does not suffice to lead a cause to triumph. Many a calamitous war has come out of less colourable hopes. The success of the Church as against external foes is one brilliant element in these illusions, and the success of the See of Peter against all rival energies within the Church is another element, more real and more lately reinforced by a great victory and by new powers.

After all that they have recently accomplished within the Church, what can be too hard, they ask, to accomplish outside? They wanted to make the entire Church an instrument in which every joint, to the remotest limb, should infallibly respond to the will of the central director, so that at any given moment, and on any one point, the whole of its force could be brought to bear wherever resistance might be encountered, or wherever an advance might promise success. To make it such an instrument required changes which were pronounced unattainable, but they laughed the discouragement to scorn. Those changes affected all the three spheres of organisation, constitution, and dogma. In *organisation* every clergyman had to be made movable at the will of the bishop, and every bishop had to be made dependent on the will of the Pope. The franchises of both the parish and the diocese had to be revoked. It is done. But it could not be done without a constitutional change. In the *constitution* the Bishop of Rome had to be made by law the Ordinary of every diocese in the

world, and every other bishop in the world had to be made by law a mere surrogate of the Bishop of Rome. That one bishop of a city which in Holy Scripture appears only as a secular capital had to be made by law the sole lawgiver even when the entire episcopate meets in a General Council, and the whole episcopate in General Council assembled had to be by law reduced from a co-ordinate branch of a legislature to what is, in effect, a mere privy council to the Bishop of Rome. It is all done. But it could not be done without a dogmatic change. In *dogma* it had to be determined that the edicts of the Bishop of Rome embodied in themselves all the alleged infallibility of the Church; ay, and even the consent of the Church, as a necessary sanction, had to be in dogma disavowed. We blame not any Liberal Catholic who said that these things were impossible. But the impossible is done. The new organisation is not a mere administrative change, but rests firmly on a new legislative constitution. The new constitution is not a mere legislative change liable to legislative revision,—it rests irreformable on adamantine dogma.

Thus, then, are the hundred and seventy millions, or two hundred millions, as they are called, bound into one very compact bundle, to be thrown into this scale or that by a single hand. Within the Church, says Vitelleschi, resistance is impossible. No obstruction can now arrest the current of command from Pope to nuncio, from nuncio to bishop and regulars, from bishop to canons and parish priests, from regulars to all manner of confraternities, from parish priests to unions and to voters. Where governments have one officer the Church has many. Where the government officer has no time to shape public opinion, the Church officer has little else to do. Where the lackeys in government service wear fine liveries, and the lords walk about like our fellow-creatures, the lackeys of the Church have fine liveries too, but the lords outshine even the theatre. Where, in Catholic countries, the officer of government comes into his seat of authority, or returns into it quietly,

care is taken that the bishop shall, at his coming, appear exalted above all principality and power. In proportion as States, becoming more Christianised, have risen above show, the Papal Church, becoming more paganised and materialised, has sunk deeper into the craft and the love of display. While the officers of government see that the young are taught the material processes necessary to future power, the officers of the Church see that they are taught for what ends it will be good, noble, and martyr-like to employ power when they shall take their future share in governing the world. Bishop Reinkens, in a little work that ought to be read by every man who means to understand the questions that are to come up—*Revolution und Kirche*—declares that the policy of the Papacy is now revolution. Certain it is that for effecting a world-wide revolution, never did instrument exist so generally outspread and so perfectly centralised, so elaborately ramified and yet so pliant, as will be the society ruled over at the Vatican when once all the old men who resisted the changes have died off, and the new generation instructed in the spirit of the Syllabus has slowly grown up, as the generations formed by Trent grew up wherever the canons of that Council were received.

Such a growth is too slow to be waited for before partial results are secured ; and every partial result it is hoped will be a stepping-stone towards the complete one. Therefore is every agency already named employed in promoting the organisation of forces to bear a part in the grand struggle when it comes ; but meantime in every local struggle. Associations of children, associations of peasants, associations of artisans, associations of old soldiers, called veteran associations, and numerous associations besides, are formed in various countries and on several models. On the social side clubs and 'circles' contribute the convivial element, and on the devotional side orders and confraternities contribute the ascetic element to the common organisation. New 'devotions,' new visions, new places of pilgrimage, new images, new prayers, new relics,

what year?

new charms, new waters of virtue, new shrines, new patrons, new miracles, and new wonders feed the flame. By tens of thousands, and by hundreds of thousands, men take an oath of obedience to the Pope. By tens of thousands volunteers pledged to shed their blood for him are enrolled,—‘On paper,’ say the Italians, mocking ; but 1867 showed that the crusaders meant crusading ; and if tens of thousands of such volunteers under leaders such as Charette are enrolled they are not to be laughed at. The schools have not been in operation during the last ten years for nothing. Associations in France bear the portentous names of Jesu-Workman and Jesu-King (*Jesu-Ouvrier* and *Jesu-Roi*),—the one aiming at organising workmen, the other at organising courts from the little maid who waits on the wife or child of the captain of the king’s host, and whose chance word may not be without weight in casting the balance of an act, or even of a character, up to the captain of the host himself, and up to the king. The name of Jesu set up on these associations clearly points to the central organising Company which Liberal Catholics with reverent indignation charge with daring to give a double meaning even to the all-blessed Name, not excepting its use in the solemn words, ‘At the name of Jesus every knee shall bow.’

Even after the 18th of July the Liberal Catholics did not give up the Church as irrevocably sunk into the hands of the Jesuits. They counted on the eighty-eight bishops who had voted Nay, and on their promise one to another not to act separately. Had that promise been kept, it was just possible that, under favouring circumstances, the fatal steps of July might have been modified or even recalled, for by all tradition the acts of any Council were supposed to remain within its power, and to be open to its revision till it was legally dissolved. The Curia put this tradition under its heel. It posted up the Decrees on the doors of the Lateran and in other public places in the city, and certified the whole world that by this act they had become its supreme and irreformable law. How did the

eighty-eight deport themselves? They had tamely allowed all manner of revolutionary acts, when done from above, and they allowed this last one as tamely as the rest. The erring Peter of the Vatican was not at the head of a community capable of producing a man who could withstand him to the face, and could tell him, as one told the erring Peter of Antioch, that he was to be blamed. Indeed, logically, the bishops seemed to have no ground of objection. The Decrees did not profess to be those of a Council, but those of the Pope, a Council having approved of them. If, then, the Pope by promulgating any doctrinal Bull without citing the approbation of a Council, could give to it the force of irreformable law, unless it should be rejected by the bishops, how much more was he entitled to give that force to these Decrees. Even had their tenets afforded them ground for resistance, the eighty-eight were not the men to avail themselves of it. From one we may learn the complexion of them all.

At midnight on the 19th of July, Von Scherr, Archbishop of Munich, who had throughout the Council acted with the Opposition, re-entered his city. He came, as the Germans say, without song or chime; that is, in strict privacy. At first many thought—and Friedrich was one of the number—that this demeanour was adopted, on the part of his Grace, to shun any public demonstration which the people might have made in honour of his attitude in Rome. But the whisper soon crept round, ‘Gregory has submitted.’

Presently the Faculty of Theology, with Döllinger at its head, came in all form to present the Archbishop with an address of congratulation on his happy return. After the formal reply to the address, his Grace said, ‘Rome has spoken: you gentlemen know the rest. We could do nothing but give in.’ Friedrich says that he saw how Döllinger was boiling, while the rest were also moved. ‘We struggled long,’ continued the Archbishop, ‘and gained much, and we also averted a deal of evil.’ This remark, says Friedrich, evidently encountered general incredulity.

The Archbishop then told of the deputation to the Pope—of which he was a member—on the 15th of July ; of the hopes raised by the reply it received ; of how those hopes were dashed by the influence of Senestrey—for he does not seem to have named Manning ; and finally, of the sad disappointment of Cardinal Rauscher on going the next day to thank his Holiness for yielding, and on hearing from those lips which to the ‘Catholic’ world are the fount of truth, that the formula which, on the previous evening, the Pope denied having seen, was actually distributed among the prelates, and was declared to be irrevocable.

At the close of the conversation, Scherr, turning to Döllinger, said, ‘Shall we start afresh to work for the Holy Church?’ The aged *Probst* replied, ‘Yes, for the OLD one.’ It was evident that, if Scherr had just then had any other man before him, his anger would have waxed hot. He suppressed it, however, and replied, ‘There is only one Church, not a new one and an old.’ Then were the words pronounced by Döllinger, ‘They have MADE a new one.’ The note was sounded. The Archbishop could only say, ‘There have always been alterations in the Church and in the doctrines.’ This speech played upon the countenances of the Professors, calling up in each case a look characteristic of the man. ‘Never shall I forget,’ says Friedrich, ‘the respective bearing of Döllinger and Haneberg.’ Döllinger was soon excommunicated ; Haneberg was soon in a bishop’s palace, but ere long he died. No one took up the conversation, and as the Archbishop turned from Döllinger to address some one else, Friedrich saw tears in his eyes.

In the hall of the university where the Professors had robed, and where they now unrobed, they spent a quarter of an hour in talking over the scene. Döllinger, however, did not stay. Rather early the next morning, the Archbishop deigned to visit the plain house in Von der Tann Street. Döllinger plainly told him that he could not receive the dogma of the 18th of July, being, as it was, in open contradiction to the past teaching and

history of the Church. In that dogma the worst thing of all was the addition made after the discussion, ‘not by the consent of the Church.’ Here was a surprise for the Archbishop. He knew nothing of that addition. He had left the field before the last gun was fired. He had now to learn the shape which his new faith had actually taken, and to learn it from the lips of Döllinger. The venerable Provost who was to be excommunicated had to tell the Archbishop who was to do the deed what the change of creed actually was for not conforming to which he was to be given over to Satan. That scene might have afforded Kaulbach another picture.

Von Scherr at first spoke in Munich of the promise made by the bishops of the minority to one another not to act separately. By the end of August he had forgotten all about it. A ‘highly placed’ layman was informed by the Archbishop that he need not trouble himself with infallibility, as the Decree would not be promulgated in the diocese, and what was not promulgated was not binding. Almost immediately afterwards it was printed in his own paper. Ere long, Scherr was as hot for infallibility as if his object had been to make the Curia forget in his present zeal any unpleasant impressions made by his former opposition. He was exemplary in protesting, threatening, and excommunicating. Friedrich gives particulars to prove, in the case of Scherr, that disregard of truth which is so freely alleged against the bishops generally, into which we will not enter.

As we have said, from one of the minority we may judge of all. Neither Hefele nor Kenrick, neither Dupanloup nor Strossmayer, displayed any Christian fortitude sufficient to arrest their Church in her downward course, or indeed displayed anything to give the Curia aught but food for scorn of the Opposition. Their convictions had been solemnly stated and ably argued. Those convictions did suffice to cause hesitation. But the force of conviction only tested the force of habit, and did not break it. The new submission made them tenfold more than ever the creatures of that overweening power which they had spent their

lives in exalting, which for a moment they had attempted to moderate, but to which they now succumbed in its most heinous assumptions.

The lower clergy have followed the bishops in submission. At one time it seemed as if many of them would withstand. Except, however, in the two countries nearest to Italy—Switzerland and Germany—no appreciable resistance has been offered. In Germany the men in whom the force of belief overcame the habit of submission were almost exclusively those whom the elevating influence of university life had lifted above the ordinary level of the clergy. Their number is not large ; but the valuable writings which they have already produced show that they have no mean power of influencing the future currents of theological thought. Spirited France, in spite of its Gallican traditions, was a pattern of tameness. The striking examples of Loysen and Michaud found exceedingly few to follow. Gratry ‘submitted.’ Throughout the rest of the world the exceptions have been isolated and without influence.

Among the laity, again, it is only in Switzerland and Germany that success has been even chequered. The otherwise uniform submission has there been broken by numbers considerable to-day, but more considerable for the future. Yet compared with the mass in submission, those numbers are soon told. But on the other hand, that mass in submission is not of uniform value to the future theocracy. It contains the cordial adherents who already believed ; the dutiful adherents who doubted, but at the word of the Council said, It is decided, and I now, as in duty bound, believe ; the reckless adherents, who, like most in Italy and many in France, would as cheerfully have submitted to a dogma declaring the Popes imponderable, as to one declaring them infallible, and who do really believe that they are irreformable. Differing from all these are men who had an intelligent conviction against the new dogma, or against the new constitution, or against both. These, brought face to face with the alternative,—submit, or bear the curse of the

Church ; submit, or survive the rending in twain of every life-tie—did sadly and slowly submit—submit without attempting to reconcile things to their reason, as it is said that Montalembert declared he would do. These men may never make apt instruments of the priests, but they do make their proud trophies. One strong man silently submitting is a statuesque monition to many others not to think. A still further element of unknown extent mingles with the mass. It consists of those who, without either formal submission or open breach, do not believe the new dogma, and do not approve of the new constitution. This now inert bulk may turn to a force bearing in either direction, or may divide into two portions ; one giving the priests control over profession and appearance, without any corresponding control over belief,—which is, perhaps, of all their triumphs the most practical ; and another in which conviction, growing at last too strong for the habit of submission, breaks by its divine force the human bond, and throws men upon their conscience, their Bible, and their God. But when men have once really believed in a God who leaves the rule over His redeemed offspring to a Vicar, and have believed in man as a creature whose conscience another man is to keep, it is hard to find in them foothold for solid Christian convictions. They are kneaded to the hand of the priest. If they leave him, they become infidels, who though in feeling his opponents, perhaps his persecutors, become in argument and action his practical allies. Joining him in rooting out faith in the Bible and in primitive Christianity, they urge men to his two extremes of doctrine, the authority of the Church or Atheism ; and consequently to his two extremes of government, the Papacy or the International. One Auguste Comte is worth many a monastery.

It is this ‘sublime’ spectacle of success with hierarchy, clergy, and laity, which makes the recent past, to the augurs of reconstruction, a certain presage of a triumph, perhaps distant, but complete, in the future. No recalcitrating bishop now ; or if a few worn-out men are still secretly of the old

inclining, they are rapidly dying off. The list of the eighty-eight is already a short one. No bishop is now installed who to the old oath which already made him a vassal of the Pope does not add the new articles of the Vatican Decrees. No seminaries are now training priests to deny the infallibility of the Pope, or his ordinary, immediate, and omnipresent authority. In most the Jesuit text-books are adopted. No catechisms are now teaching against Papal infallibility, or teaching ambiguously. The new doctrine will be couched in terms clearer or less clear, according to political and theological necessities ; but, whether in Prague or Sydney, in Florence or Liverpool, in Boston or Warsaw, in Berlin or Lima, the catechism will contain a text from which the friar or priest will put the same principles of social reconstruction into the mind of boys and girls. To the view of the Jesuits, the future unfolds like a peacock's tail, all sparkling with the eyes of the young. The outward loss to the Church which has been sustained was reckoned upon beforehand. They hold that it is more than compensated by the perfect internal compactness gained. When once the preparations are complete—and a few score years are of no account—a generation well trained will be ready at the call of him who holds among men the place of God, to take up the cross of St. Peter, to cry, 'God wills it,' and to march till all high things that exalt themselves against Christ shall be pulled down, and the Church alone shall stand, the one all-perfect society embracing the human species.

The rapturous descriptions in Ultramontane journals of a 'function' performed in a French camp under General Ducrot afford us an illustration of the silent impulse and simultaneous action which are being prepared. While upon one hill-side the troops of Ducrot were drawn up for the solemn mass, and while they, guided by the familiar signals, followed the celebrant in every turn and movement of the sacrifice, on a distant hill was drawn up another body of troops, who all the time, with equal promptitude, followed every move, guided by a special system

of telegraphy. So hereafter, in the place where St. Thomas fell at Canterbury, and in that where Hildebrand sleeps in Salerno, where Joan of Arc is venerated on the Loire, or where history has to be made in Australia, in the harbours of Malta and on the quays of Cologne, in the saloons of Brussels and on the heights of Quebec, amid the green spires of the Tyrol and by the tombs of kings at St. Denis, can be noiselessly signified the moment to chant and the moment to beat the breast, the moment to fall down and the moment to spring up crying, ‘Arise, let thine enemies be scattered.’

The loss of the temporal power affected all the calculations of the foregoing period. It came with appalling suddenness. It was an overt display of the progress by antagonism which has limited, further and still further, the circle of Papal rule, in proportion as Papal absolutism has been erected higher. It startled all men to see the Emperor who had been the sole prop of the temporal power fall, not like a prince put to the worst amid a loyal people, but with an unheard of crash like a log upon ice, while his empire instantly went under; and to see in another moment the Italian sentries standing round the Vatican. All efforts had first to be turned to a restoration. As if to illustrate the weakness which the subjects of the Pope form for any State, while yet the war was raging King William had to negotiate with Ledochowsky,¹ and ere yet the blood was dry, a petition signed by fifty-six members of the Prussian Parliament prayed the new Emperor of Germany to restore the Pope,—which meant to declare war on Italy. While the Emperor still lay at Versailles a deputation, headed by three counts, passed through bleeding France to pray the victor to flesh his sword anew. Emperor William well knew that if all the powers of the Papacy sufficed for the task, the new empire would be rent to shivers in a day. The army which had taken Paris did not march on Rome. France had next to exhibit herself as a suppliant at the feet of the Holy Father,—a Holy Father who

¹ See *Civiltà*, VIII., i., 46.

wanted her with her right arm broken to draw with her left and cut down the Italians. She met this wicked suggestion with humble requests that the Holy Father would show forbearance and not demand services for which she was not prepared. Incredible as it may seem, Father Hyacinth Loyson stated, in the *Journal des Débats*, that French bishops, before thus attempting to entangle their own government, had actually applied to the invading Germans.¹ Refused by the invader, refused by their country, they hated where they could not smite. Germany was marked for destruction ; and France was held to future service when the time should come. The struggle to break up the one and to prepare the other was forthwith begun. Meantime every effort was put forth to check and disunite Italy, but in vain. She has strained the religious toleration which the Pope abhors so as even to cover overt political hostilities. She has allowed him to issue all manner of incentives to undo the Italian kingdom by either domestic revolt or foreign intervention, or if possible by both. She has allowed him to gather together crowds of hostile foreigners and to excite them to affront and revile the nation. She has grown stronger and more solid during the process, laughing equally at the Napoleonic idea that the Pope was to be treated as if he had two hundred thousand bayonets, and at the Bonaparte violence which inflicted personal insult, prison, and exile. At this moment, after six years have passed, the Vatican as unblushingly asserts that Italy—the real Italy—is on its side as it did in the years preceding Solferino.² To curialistic eyes, the bluff and burly Victor Emmanuel is no more a permanent power than was in his day the brilliant Alberich, or the handsome Crescentius. They forget that one who would elsewhere be a very ordinary man is in Italy a phenomenon, benign or dread, according to the light in which he is viewed, and rendered very mighty by the mystery of novelty and surprise, as out of the poisonous mist

¹ Quoted in *Le Concile du Vat. et le Mouvement Infaillibiliste*, p. 62.

² *Civiltà Cattolica*, *passim*, especially the number of Dec. 16th, 1876.

of a papalised Court atmosphere loomed up the unheard of apparition of a 'King Honest Man.' They forget, too, that Alberich, not having learned the lessons of the Reformed countries, imprisoned the Pope, though his brother, and imprisoned the Pope's mother, though she was also his own, and though she had been the mistress and maker of more Popes than one, and was reputed to be the daughter of one of the best fighters and politicians in the apostolic list. Victor Emmanuel, on the other hand, has tried the experiment of letting the Pope play the prisoner or the freeman, the prophet, priest, or Cæsar, the tribune or the medicine-man, just at his wayward will. The enmity of the Pope has been good for Italy as for England, Germany, America, and all countries favoured with it; but if the day comes when the Pope meets the bow of any future Prime Minister of Italy with a responsive bow, then may we begin to look for fresh cycles of conspiracy and convulsion.

Some ten years after the morning when the red coaches with black horses, rolling over the bridge of St. Angelo, carried the Cardinals to the memorable meeting of the Congregation of Rites, one standing on the Pincio at an hour when it is not frequented might have seen, followed at a distance by a single servant in plain clothes, an elderly clerical-looking gentleman, without any sign of state except a modest glance of red stockings, taking his walk like a mortal, and casting, as he passed, no loving look upon the bust of Savanarola set up by revolted Rome among the elect of the Italian worthies. At the same time the well-known brougham of Cardinal Antonelli could not enter the palace of the Cardinal Vicar in the Via della Scrofa, where the few went to the first secret meeting to prepare for the Council, without seeing just opposite a Protestant chapel, and a shop belonging to the Bible Society and the Tract Society, while perhaps a man entering the door patted a dog. The man was a colporteur of Bibles; the dog was Pio, who had brought into Rome a little cart-load of the sacred volume through the breach in the Porta Pia. If at the same time any of the scions

of royalty who had adorned the solemnity of laying the foundation stone of the column of the Council went up to *St. Pietro in Montorio* to see how the column soared, they would have seen only a poor substitute for a column, but they would have found that the avenue by which they wound up the Janiculum bore the name of the *Via Garibaldi*.

The Curia holds that all this is but a passing cloud on the face of the Papacy, such as has often before in its history swept over it. The Italians assert the contrary. The future must be its own interpreter. Meantime in the Vatican sits a king calling himself a prisoner, though he is free to go where he will; and in the Quirinal, a king calling himself a good Catholic, though he is a rebel against the Vicar of God. If the wisdom of Italy in allowing to the Pope unlimited personal freedom has been great, the want of wisdom in professing to exalt his spiritual authority, and in giving into his sole hand the ancient powers of both the crown and the people in the election of bishops and clergy, amounts perhaps to the grossest political folly of our age. When Bonaparte dealt with the Pope as sole arbiter of the bishoprics of France, he opened a mine against the national authority, whether seated on a throne or on a president's chair, over which it has never sat securely, and in which it will one day sink if France goes on as she has done of late, giving the priests increasing power in education. But when Victor Emmanuel repeats this blunder in a form more completely providing for future Papal power, he digs a grave under the feet of his own dynasty. To Italians, unhappily, a great hypocrisy may be a great triumph of skill; they smile at principles, admire shifts, and are wondrously clever at them. In politics, till they found the principle of constitutional monarchy, they, in spite of all their shifts, floundered between fruitless conspiracy and repression,—never ending, still beginning. In religion they want what in politics they have found, a principle and a basis. Ancient scriptural Christianity, the Christianity of the Epistle to the Romans, would give them the firm rock between

the quicksands of sacerdotalism and the floods of infidelity ; a rock on which a nation might securely rise to take its place with realms which own no other foundation. But hitherto scarcely a glimmer of light on this matter has appeared among Italian statesmen. They sadly underrate the power of the Curia. The Curia know their weakness, and count upon their fall. To bring it to pass may, they think, take time ; but the Pope well knows how to play upon the king for the undoing of the nation. The contempt for all who govern through responsible ministers which streams incessantly from the ‘good press,’ and distils from the raiment of every monsignore, finds a weak barrier in the men and women who compose courts in Roman Catholic countries. Louis Philippe, by attempting to carry on a really personal government behind the appearance of responsible ministers, ruined the House of Orleans ; and if priestly arts do not fail, a similar fault will ruin the House of Savoy. Any ruler who does not in his conscience believe the Pope to be a pretender in his claims to represent God and to rule the universal Church, and who does not believe him to be the worst and greatest corrupter of the Christian religion ever brought to light by time, is in constant danger of risking all by some act of compliance induced perhaps by his religious sentiments, by the remorse of his vices, by the intrigues of the women about him, or by the guile of the ecclesiastics who lie in wait. We may take the words of Veuillot as clearly indicating the position of kings to their Lord Paramount, as viewed from above ; words written when the prospect of seating the Count of Chambord on the throne of France was bright :—

‘ We are not of those,’ says the *Univers*, ‘ who go forth to seek a king. We long have had our king—Jesus Christ. The visible king of the *Univers* is in Rome [here the ambiguity of the word *univers* is very happy]. But the *Univers* would sooner accept Henry V. than any other, since he only is worthy, as king or president of the Republic, to guide the destinies of France, as he makes the interest of the Church the highest rule of his actions, and is in all things obedient to the king of all kings, the Pope.’¹

¹ Quoted *Jesuitenumtriebe*, p. 46.

For the time being the Vatican is placed at the disadvantage of complicating the general struggle for supremacy with the particular one for the restoration of the temporal power. The ultimate end being now manifestly distant, the whole power of the perfected mechanism is turned to the gaining in detail of the proximate ends which will lead to it. These, roughly stated, are, control over elections, control over the press, and control over schools. If we take Bavaria and Belgium as favourable specimens of Roman Catholic countries, the priestly power in elections has already become a source of bloodshed, and threatens to be so in continuance. The Catholic and the Liberal parties stand arrayed as two forces, not representing, like our Conservatives and Liberals, two tendencies necessary to balance one another, but two hostile principles one or other of which must perish. In Germany the power of the Pope in elections has proved to be a real not to say a terrible one. In France it was found such at the first election after the war as to be all but sufficient to place the destinies of the country at his disposal for a time. The last general election showed a decided recoil from this danger. In Italy it had come to that point that in municipal elections the moderate party, in several instances, made common cause with the Papal one. But there, again, the last general election has given a result in the opposite direction. The terror which the priests can turn to account in elections is threefold—dread of civil hurt or loss, for which contrivances are manifold; dread of personal violence, which of course supposes a strong Catholic party; and dread of eternal ruin, which the priest of God can inflict for voting against the interests of the Church. Even on Roman Catholics not brought up in the schools of priests, these influences are powerful. What will they become with generations brought up in schools under the new inspiration of the Syllabus?

‘In every mode and by every means that is not contrary to our conscience’ is the formula expressing the solemn pledges of all Catholics to war against the revolution, or the Modern State.

Not merely as to the occupation of Rome, but in its very principles, says the *Civiltà*, will we oppose it:—

‘ We shall fight it with Catholic associations, we shall fight it with the press, we shall fight it in parliament. We shall confront theory with theory, morality with morality, school with school, the flag of Christ with the flag of Satan, raised by the revolution. Catholic societies where they existed are being multiplied, where they did not exist they are being planted. The number of Catholic members in the Prussian Parliament has increased beyond hope, and in Belgium they have drawn closer together. The struggle against the Austrian ministry which favoured the revolution has grown hotter, and *obligations in defence of Catholic principles will be imposed upon the future Members of Parliament of England and Ireland.* With whom will be the final victory?—there can be no doubt.’

As to the press, the ‘ work of the “ good press ”’ is one of the most meritorious of the many ‘ works ’ in operation for the new celestial empire. From the great *Civiltà*, the mainspring of the whole, to the episcopal organ in the remotest diocese, it moves for one end, whether in the form of review, magazine, journal, pamphlet, or book. It represents a literature really prodigious, and is in its own eyes on the high road to supremacy. Of journals it is said that in Germany alone hundreds are subsidized.¹ How far the assertions are true or false we know not, which are frequently made, that the most rabid and blaspheming organs of low and anarchical demagogues are in Jesuit pay; but those assertions in themselves are a serious symptom. In Italy it is often popularly said that there are one hundred and eighty thousand nuns, friars, and priests, all counted. In France of priests alone there are forty thousand. In Germany, as Schulte has shown, in certain cities the ecclesiastical persons, male and female, number from ten per cent. upwards of the *adult* population. If we extend to the whole Roman Catholic population of the world calculations of an organisation on a scale somewhat similar, we cannot do otherwise than regard a press which controls such a cosmopolitan force as a serious power.

¹ VIII., i., 421.

² Italian papers sometimes give the total number of journals on the Continent pledged to the Pope as 580, and of these 258 as published in Germany alone.

At the same time a twofold weakness of the '*good press*' is obvious. First, it does not carry with it the press which really leads nations, though it runs strong in by-channels of its own. And, again, it tends to change the ignorance of the general press into knowledge. In Germany this is already done. There the pious and mystic style of the Vatican dialect has ceased to be an unknown tongue. Men of letters and jurists who twenty years ago would have passed over the ecclesiastico-political phrases of a bishop or cardinal as unwittingly as an English Member of Parliament, now read them with luminous and searching insight. Even in England and America a process of self-instruction is rapidly going on in the best journals. Lord Beaconsfield, in *Lothair*, has shown that he is awake to the social and scenic aspects of the Ultramontane movement, and has displayed more insight into the genealogy of its cult than have the men in this nation to whom the country has a right to look for something better than slipshod arguments, and well-played parodies. Mr. Gladstone has shown himself awake to the national and international, to the moral and political aspects of Ultramontanism. Mr. Cartwright's work on the Jesuits shows that younger politicians are beginning to do the best thing they can do, that is, to study at original sources, and to give solid information. Mr. T. A. Trollope's work on Papal Conclaves shows that all Englishmen are not able in Rome to resist the rational tendency to see the place with unveiled eyes, and to speak of it and its ways in plain English, and that some of those who thoroughly know it are not disposed to enhance the reputation which the English of late years have been earning for love of monkish finery and open-mouthed credence of monkish fables. Perhaps in time some ecclesiastic of a rank, in the religious world, corresponding to that of Lord Beaconsfield and Mr. Gladstone in the political world, may show some grasp of the subject. The relation of our jurists to the movement is hardly so close as to warrant the hope that they will be led to such a

study of it as is now manifest among the jurists of Germany. Yet no result is so much to be desired. In fact, the whole question belongs much more to the jurist and the politician than to the theologian ; although theological ideas are throughout employed as the motive power. Yet you might as well say that all the mysteries of an express train are problems of heat, as say that all those of the Vatican movement are matters of theology. No one will ever explain the movements of a train by any mere theory of heat, though certainly no one will explain them without going back to the motive power. The mechanics presuppose the heat, and the heat is the intangible power which, when linked on by the skilful to dead weights, turns them into forces. But our political and legal mechanicians often say that they will not inspect the machinery ; it is not worked by horse-power or by water-power, it is all a question of caloric, and belongs to another branch of science. And yet the power of the engine-driver's fingers to handle the engine, and the power of the collier's arm to raise the coals, both of which would cease with a failure of heat, are questions of caloric, and all the caloric that gives them power comes not only from another province, but from another world, a world separated from fingers of stokers and from arms of colliers by tens of millions of waste and vacant miles. When you have once unlinked the vital movements of earth from the beams of that other world, you may next try to unlink the social life of men from the influence of their belief in God, and in His mode of ruling His rational offspring.

Desirable as is the control of elections and of the press, still more desirable is that of universities, colleges, and schools, for they now bear within their bosoms the electors and law-givers, the writers and readers who will hereafter mould statutes and determine the temper of armies, as well as their destination. The establishment throughout Europe of universities canonically instituted was, at the commencement of its career, pointed out by the *Civilitá* as a leading object in the movement it projected.

When we trace with Ranke the Papal restoration which in part repaired the great revolt of the sixteenth century, we find that the greatest results of that movement were not won till after a generation or two had passed away. It was only south of the Pyrenees and the Alps that the arms of Charles V. and Phillip II. effectually stayed the Reformation. In central Europe and in France the Bible, the school, and the Reformed Churches continued to spread long after the Council of Trent. When the two princely youths Ferdinand of Austria and Maximilian of Bavaria were still imbibing the Jesuit lessons of Ingolstadt, the memory of Alva had long been execrated in the Low Countries, and the songs of England had long thanked God for the overthrow of the Armada. At the same time, imperial cities on the Danube, and castles in Austria, Styria, and Bohemia, were becoming more and more centres of the Reformed doctrine. The decisive check to the spread of that doctrine was not given till education had done its work. Education did not supply the check otherwise than by ensuring the command of the sword. The schoolmaster made the Thirty Years' War. It was the teaching of Ingolstadt that trained Ferdinand to the cool, conscientious, adroit, and unrelenting use of physical force for the greater glory of God. No sooner had the young Archduke begun to rule, than week after week, in one town or another, Styria beheld the repression of the Reformed worship, till with quiet but dreadful strength Ferdinand had shut up every heretical temple, 'to the astonishment of all Germany,' as Schiller naïvely says. In this manner did he kindle the flame; and at the end of thirty years the Protestantism of Austria, Bohemia, Styria, and other States was no more. This work went on till the revocation of the Edict of Nantes well nigh accomplished for France what had been completely accomplished for Austria by Ferdinand, and for Bavaria by Maximilian.

The fighting Company of Jesus now looks to a similar process for results similar in nature, but on a wider scale. Colleges and high schools are preparing young princes, nobles, and

gentlemen to bear the part of leaders, one at the Court, another in the parliament, and a third in the camp. Elementary schools are training the followers. All round the Catholic horizon, in the literature of the new dominion, one object looms up out of clouds of hazy words, dilates before the imagination of the devout, and towers till others are dwarfed; and this object is the Crusade of St. Peter. Lads with old blood in their veins are learning how glorious it will be to lead a charge or to command a division in the greatest of all Crusades, for the most glorious of all restorations; and poor lads are learning how they that smite like Peter Jong will win in death the palm of the martyr.

M. Veuillot's description of the duty of governments in respect of education was terse: 'To allow men to be made against this perpetual plague of revolution.' To do this, governments must set aside all other moral authorities but one. The authority of parents may, indeed, determine for their children questions of diet and of dress, of calling or of fortune, but the priest is the father of the child's soul, and must determine the whole of its moral regimen. In keeping with this, the authorities of a parish or a commune, as representing the parents of a neighbourhood; a corporation, as representing the parents of a city; a legislature, as representing the parents of the whole land, can nowhere else be so effectually shut out from the realm of morals as in the school. Not, we would once more say, that the devout Ultramontane believes that by shutting them out he is loosening moral ties, for he thinks that by ensuring full scope to the sole authority of the priest, he best defends every moral right. The object of training that union of families which we call a State, to regard itself as a union without any higher end than a material one, having in it neither divine office nor divine authority, its very king filling 'a merely human office'—this object of depriving the collective households of a nation of moral authority, of emptying civil law of moral character, of stripping civil government of moral

dignity, saving only and always when authority, law, and government, owning themselves dependents of the Church, lend to her their force to carry out her decrees, and consent to borrow from her their moral right to reign, is an object which cannot be so impressively advanced by any other means as when, at the bidding of priests, a government by law renounces control over the moral portion of the training of its own citizens, conducted under its own direction, and paid for out of its own funds. The object of training the laity to own that it is not for them to have any opinion as to what, in morals or in faith, is true or false, or for them to assume any responsibility as to what is right or wrong, saving always the responsibility of fulfilling the directions of their spiritual guides, can never be more effectually promoted than when the representatives of the households of an entire community, having set up schools and provided for their maintenance, hand over to priests the power to determine whether any moral training shall be given in those schools or not, and, if any, what. The object of making every usage, from toasts given at a banquet to forms employed in the coronation of Pontiffs, insinuate or display the inferiority of the regal to the Papal authority, cannot anywhere be prosecuted with more hope of fruit than when in school every child is daily given to see that, though the king determines questions of material interest, he touches not any that are of moral consequence, but refers them to the authority of the bishop, who represents the Pope, who stands in the place of the Almighty. When all this can be carried out in the normal manner, matters are so arranged that throughout the days of impresible youth, no authority shall be heard of, as deciding any moral question, but that of the priest of God. When circumstances prevent the normal arrangements from being carried out, the way for them will be best prepared by whatever compromise leads the State furthest away from principles opposed to those of the Pontiff, and entangles it in what is called a practical solution wherein his principles are, if only

virtually, conceded. In preparing such a solution, dangers to be shunned by his agents are anything that would practically recognise the right of parents, singly or collectively, to decide moral questions for their children independently of the priests; anything that would recognise in the laity a right of moral or religious self-direction; anything that would, in practice, show that others than Romanists have the power of uniting for moral and religious purposes; anything that would allow the Bible to be honoured as a public standard without a priest; anything that would embody the hateful and condemned principle of the equality of different denominations before the law.

Bishop Reinkens has described what is the practical effect of the training now being given to very large portions of the children in Europe. It is, he says, to fix in the mind the conviction 'that Roman Catholics have a divinely guaranteed right, under certain circumstances, violently to overturn existing authorities, and the chiefs of those authorities, if they have only the power to do so, and that it is an exercise of virtue to employ all means for that end.' Bishop Reinkens¹ asserts that what formerly was regarded as a mere theory of the Curia is now its practice, namely, that, in the language of John Capestrano, the Pope 'can abrogate all human rights,' and that 'what has the force of law is just what is pleasing to him.' Even already, according to Bishop Reinkens, does the denominational instruction given in schools in Germany justify the prediction of Hefele to the effect that, for scholastic purposes, the new exaltation of the Papal power would be made the primary dogma. The bishop solemnly adds, 'The divine power of the Pope over all human beings perplexes the children in the schools; they early learn to obey the Vicegerent of God against the empire and the emperor. In the superior schools, the higher scholastic clergy attend to the same thing' (p. 8).

The most urgent question appears to be, How far will the control of schools in France ultimately enable the priests to de-

¹ *Revolution und Kirche*, p. 5.

termine the destination of French armies, and how far will their partial control of schools in other countries enable them to support any movements of France, so as to sway Roman Catholic governments, and to paralyse even Protestant ones? The enthusiastic priest strangely exaggerates the power of his order. The superficial politician no less strangely underrates it. What we at present know is, not what the clerical party will be able to accomplish, but the simple fact that the hold which it now has upon schools in France, Spain, Germany, England, and elsewhere, assures to it, in the next generation, a vast number of men trained in the doctrine of the Syllabus, and imbued with the antipathies and the hopes which, in the eye of a Jesuit, form the cardinal virtues of a soldier of God. Jesuits are often very unsuccessful in training the convictions, turning as they do many of their pupils into deadly foes. But they seldom fail to train the antipathies. Hatred of scriptural Christianity is almost invariably a ruling passion with both classes of their pupils, the Papists and the infidels. To all true disciples of the new school, the holiest of public ends will be the reconstruction of society in every country under the sky, according to the outline of the Syllabus. In pursuit of that end all means will to them be not only fair but meritorious, if adopted with a real intention to the greater glory of God. And the States of Europe have put it into the power of priests to train millions for the new school. And England has given to the effort very considerable encouragement, though doubtless that encouragement is praiseworthy in such eyes as those of the Marquis of Ripon and Lord Robert Montagu, both of whom have held high place in our department of education.

The *Stimmen aus Maria Laach* met the first mutterings of discontent with the Syllabus by saying that when those who, in pride of power, were resisting its authority, had passed away, those judgments of the Pontiff would be taught from every chair in the Catholic world. That forecast is already

fulfilled. The politics of the Syllabus and the morals of teachers like Gury are now everywhere forming the clergy of the future. And very carefully are the laity being trained in the same principles, less expanded. To them the ideal of the one commonwealth, with its one pastor-king, its unity of faith, its glory of ceremonial, its divine law, and its supernatural magistracy, is made to appear as the fairest of ideals, as one, indeed, truly divine. Around this ideal are woven accessory charms, with colours and with figures borrowed from war and peace, from asceticism and sumptuousness, from spiritual thought and material show, from history and from art. Many brave English boys—heirs, some of them, to what once were noted Protestant names; boys whose fathers or grandfathers our great schools and noblest colleges trained up in gross ignorance of the principles that are contending for the government of the world—are now imbibing from continental priests principles and passions that will one day appear in our messrooms and our legislature. And what are our great schools and colleges even now doing to prepare our youth generally to understand what the pupils of priests approve, what they condemn, and what they mean when, to innocent Englishmen, they appear to assert one thing and to deny another? Has the Papal cry for the exclusion of modern history from national universities been met by any sensible attempt to teach anything as to the elements struggling in contemporaneous history, especially the most potent ones?

In that strange literature to which the Prefects of the Pope give the name of pastorals, it is in mystic phrases often indicated that the flocks of the bellicose shepherds are to be prepared for a terrific combat. Sometimes the veil is dropped, and in plain language war is spoken of as the only means of avenging the Church for her wrongs. Men called bishops in the vineyard of Jesus Christ speak of the mustering of the opposed hosts, and of the inevitable collision, covering the design of raising nation against nation, and of raising the

people against their own rulers, by allusions to the fact that in the beginning the Church had to act without the kings, and that once more she will be obliged to throw herself upon the people. In Protestant countries, or in mixed ones, aged men in sacred vestments will say, without a blush, that the Pope himself would not make war. But let only a glimmer of political hope invite, and then kings and queens, ay, ex-kings and ex-queens, are applied to; and could the Pope only find bayonets, the same aged men in the same sacred vestments, and again without a blush, would be heard proving that in making war the Pope was only fulfilling a painful duty imposed upon him by his office as the Vicar of Christ! At this day Europe witnesses a stage of the movement of reconstruction, at which every cope and mitre in the Papal hierarchy covers a centre of force impelling to a general war. Every grey-headed bishop is an official promoter of a cataclysm that shall engulf all that opposes the Syllabus. Every friar schoolmaster and every quiet nun who teaches school is a trainer for future bloodshed. Even at his audiences the man of more than fourscore years old, fans the flame in little children dressed as soldiers, sometimes the boys of English converts; and convert fathers flatter him by hoping that their sons will yet bear his banner, so are womanhood, childhood, and old age, all fascinated by the war passion of the priest.

We do not pretend to know how it is calculated that the great struggle is to be brought on. We should think that, con-

¹ At the last moment of reviewing this chapter, before sending it to press, months after it was written, we find Italian and French journals ringing with language ascribed to a Bishop in a pastoral, which may pass as an example of the work which the officials styled bishops are preparing for Europe. He describes his entrance into the Vatican, his finding the Swiss guards and the manners of another age, and proceeds:—‘Pius IX. is still a king, even in the eyes of his enemies and of his spoilers. They are obliged to admit that the unity of Italy is not effected, that the temporal power is to be re-established, and that after some *profound commotions which, it may be, will entomb many an army and many a crown*, there will be heard among the nations, from one end of Europe to the other, a single cry, Restore Rome to its ancient lords; Rome belongs to the Pope, Rome belongs to God.’

fidently as its approach is foretold, it must be doubtful to all but those whose faith rests only on the divine destiny of the Papacy. Yet many who may not believe that the Pope is about to recover Rome, and then to make Rome the capital of the world, and who do not even believe that he will succeed in bringing about a general struggle with a view to those ends, do nevertheless fully believe that he will succeed in leading forth France once more against the Italians, and that he will, in some general complication, be able to find means of unsettling other interests so as to advance his own. To this it is replied that the Jesuits who foster these hopes are poor politicians; and that is perfectly true. Yet they are skilled in intrigue, and versed in the ways of courts and of cliques. They proudly note their hold upon schools in France, their growing hold upon colleges, the zeal of General Charette and his ex-pontifical zouaves, the military preaching of Count Mun, the adhesion to the dominion of the Syllabus, publicly signified by many French generals whose names are trumpeted with a joyful noise; and with special pride do they note such an incident as that which occurred at a recent examination in the great military college of St. Cyr, when, out of twenty-eight candidates for admission, no less than twenty-two came from one Jesuit college. They note the clubs and associations everywhere spreading ; that of the Sacred Heart, said to number a million of members; that of Jesu-Workman and that of Jesu-King, meant to organise in factory, workshop, and palace a company of soldiers as true to the chair of St. Peter as the central Company of Jesus. They note the numbers of the official class who believe that 'moral order' is to be promoted by the priests. They note the zeal of ladies, and of the aristocracy.

Beyond those encouragements openly proclaimed, lies that mystery which, in Roman Catholic countries, envelopes all Courts. At the time when Thiers was taking counsel with Louis Philippe for the fortification of Paris, or even when Guizot was making himself the tool of the Court for compass-

ing the Spanish marriages, who would have dared to tell those statesmen that both of them would survive to see the day when the fate of France for peace or war, slipping out of the hands of an exhausted Bonaparte, would virtually fall into those of one who was then a Spanish girl in a private station, one whose very name was unknown to the people of France. To this Court element of strange uncertainty—and women and priests can weave webs around presidents as well as around emperors—is to be added the solid fact that even Frenchmen, who hate the priests and dread their politics, are not healed of the idea that it is well to have weak neighbours, so divided that, at any time, an invasion of their territory is more a matter of excitement than of serious peril. We may further add that among men of the Catholic party, men zealous, devout after their manner, and well combined, the sentiment is a familiar, indeed, a favourite one, that the letting of blood periodically is a good thing, and that in Europe the sweeping away of large masses of town population would be a wholesome purge. Against all this what have we to set? Humanly speaking, only the fund of good sense and good feeling which, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, does exist among the French people to a degree far greater than they who do not know them well can realise. And beyond this, the good providence of God; for surely France is not to become a second Spain, or else to be partitioned, one or other of which lots would seem to be before her if the priests can drive her as they hope to do. Were the French people generally as regardless of law, as ready for violence and intrigue, as the clerical aristocracy, and as eager for revolution from below as they are for revolution from above, we should say that France had nothing before her but to become what Spain is, or what Italy was. But the people at large are not so.

The ‘good press’ gloats over every prospect of a general broil of nations. The failure in 1870 of calculations as to what would occur in the Catholic portions of Germany on

the breaking out of a war between France and Prussia, did not change the current of Ultramontane hope. Any great conflict, it seems to be assumed, must somehow lead to a restoration of the Pope. The poor old man has himself all along fed a belief in the certainty of that restoration. At first he seemed to emit tentative prophecies giving mystic hints of dates. Time blotted out the dates hinted at. Then came declarations more general but perhaps more impressive to the conscience of his disciples. On the second anniversary of the Roman *plébiscite*, after many promises of restoration had been long over due, the aged high priest said to the nobles of Rome :—

‘Yes, this change, this triumph is to come: and IT IS OF FAITH. Whether it is to come while I am living, while this poor Vicar of Jesus Christ is living, I know not. I know that it is to come. *The resurrection is to take place, and this great impiety is to have an end*’ (*Discorsi*, ii., p. 82).

When from the lips of the Pontiff speaking as Vicar of Jesus Christ fall the words ‘It is of faith,’ it is hard to see how the body which has now bound itself to take the faith from his lips can help accepting them as a prophecy which that body is bound to see fulfilled. And it is no insignificant proof of the portentous contents of that one dogma called Papal infallibility that so soon after it had been adopted, the creature invested by his fellow-creatures with such control over them, should, in the name of the meek Prince of Peace, commit what they consider their faith to a temporal throne for a minister of the gospel.

On the very day on which the nobles received the above prophecy, the same lips told the youths of the Catholic Association that the faithful, now passing through the deep, would soon reach the further shore of the Red Sea, and would cry with Moses, ‘We will sing unto the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously: the horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea.’ So were the Italians to fall, for as the *Civiltà* expresses it, ‘Which is of more account, the greatness of one human

kingdom, or the independence and the liberty of the kingdom of God?' (X., ii., 143).

When the Pope said, The resurrection is to take place, he reflected language used in an address presented to him a few days previously, on the sad anniversary of the commencement of the 'captivity,' as it is called, the second time it came round. The *Piana Federation* said :—

'Similar in your passion to the God-man of whom You are the Vicar on earth, the second day of Your mystic burial is fulfilled, amid the confusion of society and of Your impious guards, destined, in spite of themselves, and in the day which God shall appoint, to bear testimony to Your resurrection. In the august sepulchre wherein those whom You had laden with benefits have confined You, wrapped in the sweet spices of the lamentation and the love of Your sons, You also descend into the abyss of society as now existing, and there does Your voice resound, casting down the demons of sect, and consoling those who anxious and trembling await the blessed hour when with You they are to rise again. And the third day is already commencing ; but, as it was not completed for the Divine Saviour, so have we confidence that no more will it be completed for You, O Holy Father : the prayers of the blessed Virgin whom You have so greatly honoured, the prayers of the Saints, Patrons of the Church and of Rome, with those of so many souls who suffer and who weep to obtain Your liberation, your triumph, will shorten this day of utmost anguish, and God, God whom your enemies do with Satanic impiety unceasingly defy, will not permit the day to close without having witnessed the fulfilment of the devout desires of Your sons.'

Notwithstanding these promises, not only did the third 'day' run its course, but the sixth has set, with the Satanic guards still standing around the august sepulchre, and with the voice of the unquiet Pontiff still resounding among the caverns of this modern Hades, wherein we are all meanwhile condemned to have our abode. That is, being interpreted, for six years Italy has held Rome as her capital, and Pius IX. has confined himself to the Vatican, making speeches. But at this moment the hope of a general compunction, and of a restoration as the effect of it, is very lively. The present obscuration of the Papacy is treated as if it were passing and light as the shadow

¹ *Discorsi*, ii., p. 70. The capitals to the 'divine pronouns' are not ours.

of an April cloud on the Alban Hills. The shadow will pass and the hills will abide. Rome, for a moment the mere capital of a kingdom, is to be the capital of the world. Let but the temporal power be once restored, and then the steps to the universal theocratic monarchy can be taken both with deeper secrecy and with greater force.

In the strange affinities of history few instances have been more curious than that which just now presents the Pontiff, the Sultan, and the Jew, as drawn together. This conjunction occurs on a question which was formally raised as one between Christian and anti-Christian. A great and a general broil is hoped for at the Vatican. In prospect of it three great forces are moved to co-operation, though incapable of mutual sympathy. They consist of those who rejected Christ as a false prophet, of those who replaced Him by a later prophet, and of those who enact upon earth a professed continuance of His work by sacrificing priests, and of His office in the person of a priest-king. The conjunction is one to fix the eye of the warrior and the sage, of the divine and the political partisan, of the plotting priest, the plotting anarchist, and the plotting jobber, of the student who in history sounds the lore of the past, and of the student who in prophecy would scan the divine plan of the future.

Even those who most despise the political influence of the priests must own that for disturbance their power is great. Taking the sixty years which have elapsed since the peace of 1815, let us, for a moment, look at the Roman Catholic countries of Christendom, and at the non-Catholic ones, in respect of the one blessing of public repose. In those sixty years the three great Protestant powers—England, Prussia, and America—have not drawn the sword one against the other. The smaller Protestant powers have not fought among themselves. No Protestant capital has undergone a foreign occupation. With the exception of America, no Protestant State has been desolated by civil war. No Protestant army has

been given to military insurrection, or has, in the day of trial, proved untrue. No Protestant sovereign has been expelled by his own people. No Protestant President of a Republic has been executed, or exiled, or condemned as a traitor. No Protestant monarchy has been changed by violence into a republic; no Protestant republic into a monarchy. If we set off as one against the other, the war of German unity which partly occurred in the one group of States, and that of Italian unity which occurred in the other group, the only case of war between Protestant States, in the two generations, has been that of Prussia and Denmark, and the only case of war between two great powers non-Catholic has been that of Russia and England, in the Crimea. But how has it been on the Papal side of the line?

No leading Catholic power can be named which has not within the sixty years made war on other Catholic powers as well as on non-Catholic ones. France has fought with Spain, with the Italians, with Austria, as well as with Russia, with Prussia, with Holland, and has even gone away to Mexico to seek a war of which the Vatican spoke as if it were a campaign of the Church. Austria has fought with Italy and with France, as well as with Prussia and with Denmark. As to the wars of Catholic States in America with one another, they have been numerous. Rome has undergone twenty years of foreign occupation; France has undergone two; and Austria has had recourse to foreign intervention. Civil war in Portugal, civil wars in Spain, civil war in Austria, civil war repeatedly in Italy apart from the great war of unity, civil war chronically in the American Catholic States, have made that plague familiar in Roman Catholic countries. The foremost, and the least priest-ridden of them, France, has had her three days of July, her three days of February, her four darker days of June, her bloody days of December, her awful weeks of the Commune. Military insurrections properly so-called have not occurred in the great

Catholic nations that refused to submit to the disciplinary decrees of the Council of Trent. But in Spain, Portugal, and the nations of America, military insurrection, that worst of anarchies, seems to have acquired a sort of prescriptive place in the Constitution. In Italy, till 1860, the armies of the princes faithful to the Papacy were largely foreign. As to conspiracies and risings, it is strange that where they have occurred out of Roman Catholic States they have often been among the Roman Catholic portion of the population; and in Roman Catholic States they have been much more frequent within the circle of countries where the decrees of Trent had been fully accepted, than in those which, by Gallican liberties, Josephine laws, or in some other form, uphold national supremacy. As to thrones in Roman Catholic countries, the difficulty is to name those which during the sixty years have not been emptied by violence; Austria and Sardinia, perhaps, exhaust the list, in both of which, however, an abdication, compelled by misfortune, has taken place. Twice has a limited monarchy, once an empire, and once a republic, been overthrown in France by revolution. As to Spain and South America, it were weary work to count up catastrophes. The discrowned princes who, like ghosts, haunt Europe, and the ex-presidents under ban who prowl in America, are nearly all Roman Catholics.

Perhaps the entire course of history does not afford an example of any contemporaneous development of four great powers, bringing with it in the aggregate such an increase of territory, population, and strength, as that which within the sixty years since the peace of Vienna has occurred in the case of the four non-Catholic powers, Russia, Prussia, America, and England. No corresponding development has taken place in Roman Catholic or in Moslem nations. Italy, indeed, has risen up, but only by breaking the yoke of the Papacy, and by swimming against a sulphurous stream of anathemas.

The formidable confidence in their own power to overturn

all existing civil authorities which breathes in the writings of priests, is easily accounted for by the frequency with which they witness first the instability, next the violence, and ultimately the fall of all authorities in the countries where civil dignitaries may, indeed, reign, but where the clergy really govern. In such countries ‘merely human authority’ is all undermined. The priest does not suspect that his spurious ‘divine’ authority has done it. But so it is. A caste of priests has no known place in the Christian religion,—a religion that abolished a priestly tribe, but set up none; set up only a meek ministry far removed from the office of a sacrificing priest, or the pretensions of a lord of men; as far removed as was that Master who alone is the pattern and the law of the Christian minister. The priest has no tolerable place in human society; for as a celibate he is the bondslave and agent of an encroaching power, and for him the sanctities are abjured, and, by edict of a throne that aims at ruling all the earth, the natural ties are cut whereby the great Father binds man into families, and links families into States. Without warrant, except in the assumptions of a caste, he comes in, an unnatural authority displacing all the authorities that are natural, while fancying that he anoints them. What is natural, and therefore divine, he calls human; what is not natural, what is unnatural, he accredits to his conscience by calling it supernatural. Beside the husband is set up a head over the woman,—an unnatural head, a vowed celibate, but higher than the husband. Beside the parents is set up a head over the children,—an unnatural head, one without lawful children; but this head is higher than the parents. Beside the magistrate is set up a head over the town,—an unnatural head, for the work and office of the minister of Christ is to attend to the Word of God and to prayer; yet this head is higher than the magistrate. Ay, and beside the king is set up a head over the country,—a head altogether unnatural, a strange mixture of heathen Pontiff and temporal ruler, baptized with Christian names, and enunciating Christian doctrines, with paganised ad-

ditions and qualifications, seeming in particular after particular to represent, under the name of Christ, the ideal opposite of what Christ was. And this spurious authority, this fighting priest and sacrificing plotter of war, is higher than the king. No wonder that in countries which submit to the intrusion of such an unnatural power, the true authorities, which are rooted in nature, and on which shines the sanction of the Word of God as kindly as the sun on the growing corn, should droop as if some unseen creature had gnawed away their roots. No wonder that family life should decay. No wonder that mansions should be rare and convents numerous ; that schools should be few and beggars many ; that books should be scarce and ecclesiastical gewgaws plentiful ; that men for hard enterprise should be minished, and men for plays and pomps and follies and conspiracies should abound. No wonder that arts should be less advanced, life less secure, property less sacred, and that public institutions, becoming less capable of the reforms that prove vitality and prolong growth, should decay and eventually fall. No wonder that in such countries the commons should be often oppressed, that nobles should be often cast down to the dust, and that even thrones should scatter their occupants as if by inherent unsteadiness. But, unconscious of his own false position, and buoyed up by his firm persuasion that the authority of the clergy is divine, and that other authorities are but human, the priest views the disturbances which arise around him only as a call to place all things, and that speedily, under the control of the supernatural order. And for this end he is determined to try the issue of a long and mortal struggle with all the other authorities in the world.

It would be a curious and not altogether an idle speculation did some clearheaded and calm economist carefully work out the question, What would be the effect, in the course of three hundred years, upon the peace of Europe, on the bulk of standing armies, on the stability of thrones, on the development of arts, sciences, laws, and morals, on the security of life and property,

and on the general spread of charity, brotherhood, and virtue among men, supposing that by some unseen power the hundreds of thousands of priests, now working to bring about the dominion of the Pope over our species, could be instantly changed into simple ministers of the gospel, without a political head or a political aim, but each one seeking only to bring the wicked to repentance, and to lead the godly onward, adding virtue unto virtue and grace to grace? Would the change bring France more wars and more revolutions? Would the change make the new career opened to Italy more obscure or thorny? Would the change make Austria feebler, or make Spain less united and prosperous? Would it bring a blight upon Mexico? and in South America would it make the rulers less tranquil, the people less obedient to law, and less attached to order? Would the south and west of Ireland less strongly attract capital and residence? would Croatia be less refined? would the Island of Sardinia be less highly civilised? would Sicily be less secure? Would the dominion of Canada be more difficult to govern? Would the city of New York and other cities of the United States in which the political power of priests is now formidable be worse ordered and more corrupt? Would the internal and international relations of Chili and Peru, of Ecuador and Venezuela, and of the other South American nations, be more liable to entanglement? In Hayti and St. Domingo, would public affairs be more unstable, would family life be more blameworthy?

Or conversely: What would be the effect of a change in the opposite direction? Suppose that at once every Protestant minister could be changed into a zealous priest, and that the Headship of the Pope could exert its full influence unshackled by those restraints which have hampered him ever since the Reformation—partly, indeed, ever since the large-eyed man of Lutterworth brought into existence that terrible thing the English Bible—and suppose that with all the liberty of power and all the power of liberty he could rule over the whole of Christendom

as completely as he formerly ruled over his own States, with the additional advantage of being freed from those extraneous influences which, flowing in from reformed countries, or from countries partly reformed, put a constant check even in Rome on many a growth that would otherwise have flourished,—what would be the practical effect of his thus ruling, with a competent army of priests and schoolmasters, and a due provision of nuns, to conform what is now the chaos of Protestant and Liberal nations to what was a while ago the Model State, within which no act morally wrong could be done by authority? Would Scotland produce more authors, heroes, and worthies, fewer beggars, thieves, rioters, and assassins, than she does to-day? Would England produce more good landlords, more comfortable tenants, more honest merchants, more bright men of letters and science, more deeds of Christian charity, and fewer civil wars, fewer conspiracies, fewer insurrections, fewer military revolts, fewer beggared nobles, and fewer ill-cultivated estates than she does to-day? Would Germany be more united? would Holland, Denmark, and Sweden be more stable? would the United States be more prosperous, more free, and more peaceable? would the British Colonies be increasingly tranquil and enlightened?

With the facts of the past, and the principles of the present, which are to be the plastic forces of the future, before him, a calm and wide-minded observer, taking long stretches of time and great varieties of circumstance to illustrate any hypothesis and to test any conclusion, might form an estimate which would not be without a properly scientific value. We are often told by one class of writers that Roman Catholics are as good subjects as Protestants, and by another that in proportion to their numbers they yield a much greater amount of illiteracy, of turbulence, of pauperism, and of offences against the law. The former class of writers often evidently mean that some Roman Catholics are as good subjects as some Protestants, or even as any Protestant,—a platitude which the most

heedless writer, if he took time to define to himself the sense of his words, would hardly care to pen. But if on the average Roman Catholics keep the law as well, contribute to the resources of the State as much, serve the State with an eye as single as Protestants, and do not burden its funds, or cause trouble to its functionaries any more than they do, then, on the average, they are as good citizens. If on the other hand they, on the average, register more offences against the law, contribute less to the State, whether by taxes, inventions, or enterprises, serve it with more effort to promote a double interest, come more upon its funds, local or national, and cause more employment to its administration, and therefore more cost, then they are, on the average, worse subjects. These are points which statesmen have no right to leave to theologians, and on which they have no right to remain themselves in doubt. Above all, they have no right if not in doubt about them, but if they have on sufficient grounds a clear opinion, to keep that opinion back, or to cloud it by ambiguities. Both in England and in America there are intelligent and loyal men who believe that they are more burdened and that public law and order are less well observed in proportion as priests have power over any section of the population. These are questions of fact capable of a scientific solution, and it is the duty of statesmen scientifically to solve them. Their duty is to test principles by fruits, and to tell mankind what witness the fruits bear. If the authorities, which are clearly natural and Christian, clearly both divine and human, are undermined where priests do not rule and are built up where they do, let statesmen tell mankind that it is so. If the unnatural, the merely artificial authority of the priest is proved, on a test of ages, of various races, and of various polities, to be unfriendly rather than helpful to the stability and vigour of lawful authority, then let all incumbents of that authority—kings, presidents, nobles, lawgivers, magistrates, parents, and husbands—lift up a clear voice, the voice of intelligent conviction, and tell all

men how the matter stands. ‘The sword of the mouth’ is the only sword which ought to be drawn in this war; and if they to whom God has given real authority draw that sword against the spurious authority of the priest, it will prevent the call which otherwise will surely come to draw a feebler sword but a bloody one. Priestcraft, mighty against artifice, subtle against force, invincible against compromise and subterfuge, is strangely weak against a calm and Christian denial of its authority.

Long since this chapter was written, we find that the Italian journals, while noting the base immorality which week by week is brought to light among the priests, and pointing to their multitude and the low repute of many of them as a moral plague, now (1877) fasten upon them even more than of wont charges of exciting anarchical conspiracies. In other countries they are also, by Roman Catholics, often accused in popular language of keeping up the red International by the aid of the black. The *Emancipatore Cattolico*, the organ of what is called the Italian National Catholic Church, formed by the priests who belonged to the Society for the Emancipation and Mutual Aid of the Clergy, writes as follows:—

‘The *red* International, in appearance with a different end and program, but in reality in full accord with its *black* sister, after the stimulus from the Vatican sets itself in motion, and lifts up its head. . . . We ask, Has the alliance of this double International a probability of success in a future nearer or more remote? We do not hesitate to reply affirmatively if the powers and States in the two hemispheres do not agree rather to overthrow the *black* international which is the true and efficient cause of the other, than the *red* which is the effect. . . . Christian governments of Europe, open your eyes! the international that truly menaces you, and that will undo you if you are not wise, is that of the Vatican. You accept it and smile upon it because you suppose it to be the conservator and champion of order and authority; but the order and the authority which it represents and champions are those of the absorption of all the social powers into the despotic and arbitrary will of a miserable mortal who believes himself to be God, and who as such imposes himself upon the entire universe.’¹

On the one hand, ex-priests say things like these, and great

¹ *L'Emancipatore Cattolico*: Napoli, Anno XVI., No. 14.

numbers who have known priests from their youth up say that they are (though not all) capable of the conspiracies thus charged against them, and, indeed, that the Jesuits often hatch such conspiracies.¹ On the other hand, men as sober as the Archbishop of Florence speak, in tones more or less ominous, of awful events impending that may fill up ages, may lay nations waste, may leave no institution standing but the Church alone, and may cause the name of prince to be one that shall cease to sound. However unfounded may be the charges of conspiracy on the one side, or however fallacious the auguries of a general cataclysm on the other, the prospect for the Roman Catholic nations is dark. The fact remains that in those countries either the most numerous and influential professional class is capable of conspiring with anarchists against the general repose, or else that the people are so utterly depraved that they, in great numbers, without grounds, bring such a charge against an innocent professional class. In either case, how are such countries to escape great troubles and rapid deterioration? Those troubles and that deterioration are the effects which may be most surely reckoned upon from the priestly agitation in favour of war now discernible all over Europe. What trials the army of priests and schoolmasters now practising their movements may be able to inflict on Protestant States we cannot pretend to foretell. But as to the nations of which they are the moral leaders, it would seem certain that by war, civil or international, probably by both, and by the wear and tear of constant clerical agitation, they will gradually fall behind—fall behind not only in knowledge on which depend the arts both of peace and of war, but

¹ The English reader may see an example in a recent publication by an Italian gentleman of a well-known family, and himself an ex-priest. Speaking of Venice in 1848, he again and again alludes to plots by priests to promote the lowest kind of discord and acts of violence for political party purposes. In doing so, the idea that what he says would strike any one as improbable does not seem to have occurred to him. See *My Life and what I Learnt in it*. By Giuseppe M. Campanella. Bentley, pp. 344, ff.

also in morals and in cohesion. Intellect will be narrowed, passions will be embittered, piety itself will take the ecclesiastical stamp instead of the godly, natural authorities will be loosened at the roots, and the joint domination of the celibate priest and the celibate zouave, lowering the tone of family life, will lead the people down and further down in the way wherein the eyes of wise men have long seen that priest-ridden nations are travelling. The Brahman of the East, the Brahman of the West, and the Moolah who dwells between, are all deplored the *Kali Yuga*—the evil age, the chaos and decay of the species.

While these last sheets have been passing through the press, events have occurred which illustrate many of the hints contained in this chapter. To detail the grounds on which those hints rest would, in itself, require a volume. Many, however, who, when we first began to write this work, would have seen nothing ‘practical’ in that solemn hint of Vitelleschi when, speaking of the frequent occurrence of disturbances at the same time when the Church is pressing some point upon a government, he says that the circumstance is an organic phenomenon deserving of the most serious attention, now begin to feel that it is scarcely rational any longer to be insensible to facts which day after day rise into the view of Europe.

In March 1877, Pius IX. delivered a carefully-prepared Allocution, full of bitter attacks on Italy, and manifestly intended to raise once more the Roman Question. A feverish agitation becoming speedily discernible in different countries, none could help noting the coincidence of the two events. In Italy broke out an attempt at insurrection in Benevento, professedly by socialists, but as the Italian papers believed fomented and directed by priests, to give an example of that chaos in order to exhibit which they, rightly or wrongly, are extensively credited, with concocting civil disorders, calculated to make an impression that society must have

recourse to 'moral order' in their own sense. This was speedily followed by a vote of the Italian Senate, by which that body threw out a Bill, that had been passed by the Lower House, for restraining ministers of religion, of all denominations, from certain abuses of their office. Whether with grounds or without them we know not, Italian journals of different shades intimated their impression that this event was solely due to the direct action of the Pope upon the king, and of the king upon a number of courtier senators. If nothing more than an impression, this, even as such, was portentous. At the very least, the king and the senate were thought to be capable of being swayed by those who were thought to be capable of fomenting factitious disorders. Such suspicions added nothing to the Italian estimate of what the Curia might be guilty of; but they undermined confidence in both the Crown and the Senate, and for the Pope that was great gain.

Shortly afterwards the Prime Minister of France, M. Jules Simon, explained in debate, with all propriety of language, that the popular idea about the Pope being a prisoner was unfounded. The Pope, in that characteristic style which has never risen to the level even of municipal, much less of national public life, stated that a certain government had said that the Pope was a liar; and as if to rehabilitate any one who might have been so impertinent, he added that he did not know what government it was! Soon afterwards, on the 16th of May, 1877, M. Simon was abruptly dismissed by Marshal MacMahon, and the assembly, of which a majority supported M. Simon, was silenced by an enforced adjournment. This pale edition of a *coup d'état* was hailed and claimed by the clerical papers as a direct result of the interference of the Pope. Its ill effects in France forced upon many the reflection, how enviable is the lot of nations in which the influence of the Pontiff is feeble, and how well would it be with any nation in which that influence should be *nil!*

— / —

Simultaneously with these events the priestly agitation for war and revolution, or, as the priests call their own revolution, for social order, Christian civilisation, or the Christian Constitution of society, ran so high that serious concern took possession, as the Press showed, at one and the same time of many minds in France, Germany, Italy, and other countries. In the expressions of that concern it was manifest that while many still remained in that state of fancied knowledge, but real ignorance, which favours an alternation of unintelligent scare with unintelligent security, either of which is helpful to a cosmopolitan conspiracy, not a few had begun to speak with a precision which would at once make the priests aware that their freemasonry was no longer a total secret, though in great part it is so still. Italy, which has suffered most from the Papacy, is readiest at detecting both its principles and its wiles. Just in time for our last revise of this sheet appeared in the *Daily News* of June 5th, 1877, the following communication from its correspondent in Rome, headed, 'THE MILITIA OF JESUS CHRIST,' a communication which brings to a focus much that has passed under the eye of the reader relating to the crusade of St. Peter, to the great and blessed work of Dominick, to the rosary, to the way to make a Catholic world by a Christian army, to the way to establish the social reign of Christ, or of the Gospel, or of the King of all kings, or of the Spiritual David, or the Vicar of God; and to the perfect blessedness of dying in arms for St. Peter, or for the vindication of the rights of the Church, or for the glory of Holy Church:—

'ROME, May 30th.

'In Italy and in France there is in circulation a "Program of the Militia of Jesus Christ," copies of which in French and Italian are now in my hands, and the appeal it contains to the Catholic youths of these countries, to enrol in the army of the Church Militant, has been answered in numbers and with an alacrity which causes serious concern to the Italian government. I subjoin a translation:—

“MILITIA OF JESUS CHRIST.

CATHOLIC CRUSADE.

Hallowed be Thy name : Thy kingdom come.

1. THE AIM.—The Militia of Jesus Christ, or Catholic Crusade, is a pious association which has for its object—first, to re-establish the social reign of Jesus Christ our Lord in the world ; second, to defend the rights of the Church and its august Head ; third, to array against the powerful organisation of the secret societies leagued against the Lord and His Church, an innumerable army of devoted Catholics, ready to fight in open day, with all the means in its power, those who work in secret and in darkness.

THE MEANS.—“The Cross remaining our sole defence,” said Pio Nono in his discourse of the 20th September, 1874 ; and arms not being possible at this moment for the vindication of the rights of the Holy See, the soldiers of the Catholic Crusade, rearing the standard of the Christian, will fight with energy, by prayer, by word, and by writing, to restore to our Lord Jesus Christ the place which is His due in the world. They will propagate the collection of Peter’s Pence ; they will labour to revive the spirit of faith in society, opposing to human prerogative the public practice of the ancient Christian usages which have fallen into desuetude. Finally, the constant aim of their efforts will be to unravel the plots of the secret sects.

3. Its DUTIES.—It is obligatory on all members of the Crusade—first, to pledge themselves formally to renounce every work or association condemned by the Church or contrary to its spirit ; second, to give the example of a religious observance of the laws of the Church by a perfect submission and a filial docility to the instructions of the Holy See ; third, to recite the Rosary entire every week ; fourth, to approach the Sacraments as frequently as possible—at least on the four great feasts of the year ; fifth, to refuse all contribution or support to bad publications, and to encourage the good ones according to their means ; sixth (finally), to wear the Cross of the service openly (or at least under their clothes, if for any reason it is impossible to wear it otherwise). Grave breach of duty or misconduct will provoke an admonition, and after a third admonition will be followed by expulsion from the Militia.

PARTICULAR DUTIES FOR THE DIFFERENT CATEGORIES.—FIRST, CATEGORY OF PRAYER : Those who will not be able to contribute to the propagation of the work otherwise than by prayer will have to recite at least once a day the Chaplet or the little office of the Holy Virgin. SECOND CATEGORY OF WORDS AND WRITINGS : Those who enrol under this category must *ipso facto* subscribe to the Catholic Press, to the diffusion of good books, to all the Catholic works, and especially to those which have for their object Christian instruction and education. THIRD, CATEGORY OF OFFERINGS : Those who wish to contribute by

their gifts must pledge themselves to give at least one franc a month to Peter's Pence, and to work for the propagation of the same.

‘4. ORGANIZATION.—All the faithful of either sex must take part in it. The crusaders are divided into companies of ten, male or female, under a promoter or promotress. A company of five tens (*un chapelet*) form a presidency under a president (male or female). Three presidencies (a rosary) form a priory with a prior or prioress. The chief hierarchy, composed only of men, shall have a general grand master, grand commanders, and commanders. In every locality where there will be at least a prior, an ecclesiastic will be named the spiritual director. Every dignitary shall act in concert with his council, composed of those who in the hierarchy are immediately subordinated to him.

‘5. HISTORICAL.—The Militia of Jesus Christ, founded by St. Dominic in 1209, to combat schism and heresy, to defend the Church and society when menaced, was a religious and military order which has rendered great services to Christianity at large. Pursuing its mission almost without interruption down to our own day, adapting itself to the exigencies of the day, the Militia remained in the background every time that the causes which provoked it disappeared, and resumed its importance when the need for it was felt. It is for this reason that in 1870, with the benediction of our Holy Father the Sovereign Pontiff Pio Nono, a new impulse was given to this work when the triumphant revolution had unmasked its sinister designs.

‘6. INDULGENCES, ETC.—The Militia of Jesus Christ enjoys numerous indulgences accorded by the supreme Pontiffs at different epochs. Besides these indulgences, the crusaders, by the sole fact of their admission, may enjoy the indulgences of Saint Rosary and of the Name of Jesus; while the persons forming part of these two confraternities have no new obligations to fulfil to become “crusaders,” unless it be to sign their adhesion and wear the cross, etc.

‘His Holiness the Pope Pio Nono deigns to bless the projects for the reconstitution of St. Dominic's work.

‘This vast association, I am assured, numbers at this moment more than a million volunteers in the Catholic countries, principally in France and Belgium. The recurrence of the episcopal jubilee of the Pope has given occasion to the recruiting operations now going on in Rome and throughout Italy. Already, indeed, you may see, in places of public resort, the “crusaders” of the new service wearing their badge of a little cross of white metal, surmounted by a royal crown.’

So other English Collingridges and Watts-Russells, other Dutch Jongs, other French Guillemins and Dufournels, and other Italian Goldonis, are yet to be lured on by plotting

priests to the death of the invader, by the hope of promoting the greater glory of God. Next to the heads of the tonsured on which already so much blood-guiltiness rests, it will be upon the heads of those politicians who have put youth into the hands of priests that the guilt of whatever further blood-shed may arise will fall. Louise Philippe lived to see but small part of the fruit of his error. Thiers has lived to see ominous first-fruits, but only first-fruits, of his. The recompense of their own error has been tasted, and that very bitterly, by the Germans. Of all the blameworthy politicians they who had least excuse were our own, and for them the time of fruit is not yet. As for religionists, who for sectarian ends took their part in putting British youth into the way of being trained for and hurried into such a service as is indicated above, few of them may live to reckon with the nation when the fruits of their fault come to maturity. But that every school conducted by priests is a recruiting place for that service every year will make plainer. Against the cosmopolitan plot, of which the only chance of success would lie in the unsuspecting ignorance which art and, at need, oaths would flatter, publicity is the most effectual of all opposition. Ignorance, while it favours the advance of stealthy revolution, at the same time exaggerates the skill and power of the movers for its spread. Let men but know what the Pope and his priests mean, and when once they have passed the stage of incredulity, and entered on that of intelligent appreciation, the mystic phrase, the unctious disclaimer, the solemn denial, the haughty denunciation, will have no more weight with them than robes, banners, processions, images, and all kinds of music; for men having learned what the professional saviours of society are, will cease to trust or to fear them, will only pity and shun them, and will disperse their influence by telling the truth. That will be the sure way to prevent the rekindling of the burning fiery furnace, that favourite instrument of Catholic unity under Pontiff-king Nebuchadnezzar, under Pontiff-king

Nero, and under Pontiff-king Ghislieri the personal model of Pius IX. It will also be the way to avert that great struggle intended to bear a proportion to the Thirty Years' War such as it bore to the little campaign of Mentana.

Strange does it seem that the prophets of reconstruction should for encouragement point more frequently to France and England than to any other countries. To France they look for military service, to England for religious converts. The one is to glorify the Church by a sacred war, the other by an edifying submission. In France they count upon the schoolmasters, the army, the ancient aristocracy, and many of the politicians. In England they count upon that portion of the clergy which they call the Puseyite party, upon a portion of the aristocracy, upon the ceremonies in the churches, and the teaching in the denominational schools. As to France, their confidence is higher since the war of 1870. As to England, since the Vatican Council a less confident tone is discernible under their boasts of the great services being rendered by the clergy. Grossly exaggerating, as they do, the position and the influence of Cardinal Manning, and speaking at times as if the whole English hierarchy, unable to face him, were trembling and falling down before him, they also exaggerate the strides actually made by the Ritualistic party in carrying the whole nation towards submission to Rome. They boast, in the language of Dr. Newman, that the English Church is, through that party, 'doing our work';¹ and they always seem to have taken to heart the principle which he taught them as long ago as 1841: 'Only through the English Church can you act upon the English nation.'² They are not much read in our political literature, and when they meddle with it, often make strange blunders. But some of them are shrewdly aware of the services done to their cause by writers who treat Ritualism as a matter of æsthetics, and treat each particular ceremony as a trifle.

¹ *Apologia*, Appendix, p. 27.

² *Ibid.*, p. 313.

Looking back on the turns and windings of the movement for reconstruction, and remembering how little human foresight would have availed to predict either their successive phases or the results up to the present hour, it is natural to feel that as to those further turns and windings which as yet lie out of ken, hidden behind the veil of an inscrutable Providence, it is not for us presumptuously to divine. Rather would we, in humble hope, await the future, so far as to us it may be permitted to witness its unfolding. In the sixty years since the peace of Vienna the Papacy has passed through two distinct stages, of thirty years each ; the one up to the beginning of the present pontificate, the other during the course of it. In the first thirty years the flag displayed was that of Liberal Catholicism. During that time the Papacy gained emancipation in England and Ireland, a footing in the schools of France and Belgium, a repute of liberality and other great advantages; while on the whole it held its ground in Italy, Spain, Austria, and the minor States. But a true instinct taught the Curia that temporary gain was preparing final ruin. Since 1849 the policy has been reversed, and the external results to the Papacy so far have been disadvantageous. 'Catholic unity' has been lost in Italy, Spain, Portugal, Austria, Mexico, Brazil, and elsewhere. In Poland the losses to the Church have been immense, whether they may be due to the persecuting policy of Russia, as the Catholic party alleges, or to the rebellious excitements of the Pope and the priests, as others allege, or to both these causes united, as seems most probable. In Switzerland and Germany the Papacy has had heavy loss, and its future is gloomy. In France it has made immense gains; in Ireland heavy loss; in England gain, and that of the kind it values most,—gain by the help of the clergy, of the aristocracy, and of a great university. But still, while the population of the United Kingdom has much increased, Pius IX. cannot count among the thirty millions now inhabiting it so many Roman Catholics as he found among, say, five millions less. He has to note a

decrease in Poland concurrently with persecution, and one in the British Isles concurrently with extended political privileges. The Curia, if not unconscious of these losses, never confesses to them, and avers that the increased compactness gained by recent changes far more than compensates for any increased opposition, and in fact insures the overthrow of all resisting forces ; while the submission of England—Queen, bishops, lords, and people—is spoken of as a thing nigh at hand to the eye of faith. Firmly, however, do we believe that in mercy to this great empire, within which dwells in peace and with ample privileges a portion of mankind larger than ever before under one sceptre enjoyed the blessings of free government, and in mercy also to the whole redeemed race in the midst of which this empire holds a place so influential and on the whole so beneficent, never will England justify the promises of submission to the Pope wherewith continental priests are wont to cheer the courage of their partisans, albeit they proudly point to men in important places, and boast how the triumph of the Vatican is being prepared under the patronage of both Church and State.

All this notwithstanding, we do not believe that the English commons are to be reduced into a populace without constitutional representation ; or that the English aristocracy is to be reduced into an order of nobles without constitutional powers ; or that our magistracy, from squire up to chancellor, is to be put under the bishops' courts ; or that our chairs of philosophy, science, and literature are to be placed under the tutelage of chairs of theology filled by Jesuits, or by men of whom Jesuits approve ; or that our universities are to be placed under Romish canon law ; or that the priest, to the exclusion of the State and of the laity, is to be made as completely moral lord of all the schools in England as he is now of his denominational schools ; or that the works of our authors are to wait till a Dominican has cut out what he deems amiss, and has written on the remainder *Imprimatur* ; or that our printers are to

wait for a licence from the friars; or that our journals and periodicals are to be cut down to the proportions which were allowed to the press in the Model State; or that our armies are to be composed of men so schooled that to them the word of the priest shall take the lawful command out of the lips of the king. Nor do we believe that the ancient throne of England, reposing now in such quiet grandeur on the convictions and the affections of a people free to think and proud to be loyal, sustained by the sacred authorities of the husbands, the parents, the magistrates, the legislators of the land, is, like the unstable thrones that lean upon Romish priests, first to become unsettled, and then, amid shocks and changes, to await the time when it shall disappear to make way for a new federation of Spiritual States, or else of States held by the vassals of a so-called spiritual power. No more do we believe that from these English shores the dear old English Bible is to be driven away as a forbidden book. Rather will the growing brightness of the five hundred years which have passed over us since first its light glanced among the dim cloisters and the woodland glades of a poor and unlettered country, be in the five hundred years to come—if five hundred are to come—exceeded by a stronger light, and one shining more and more unto the perfect day. Neither do we believe that for these fair fields of Britain that dark Saturday night is to come after which will no more dawn the English Sunday morning,—a morning when streets thronged and country lanes enlivened with families wending their way to worship God, each as led by the voice of conscience, and each jealous for the religious liberty of its neighbours as well as for its own, present a more Christianlike and more solid display of unity in variety, and of catholicity in charity, than ever can be gained by any preciseness of constrained uniformity. Never will our own happy Sunday morning cease to shine; never instead of it will a dismal day come when the sound of the church-going bell shall be the signal of physical

force, and when every one whose conscience will not let him obey the official call shall be spied out by the familiars of the Inquisition.

When priests in scarlet and in violet, in needlework and in gold, tell Englishmen that such things as are here indicated are not really embraced within the ultimate objects of their movement, they well know that they can deceive only those who have not sought out their principles at the fountain. And under all their illusions, they must surely have some consciousness that such as have done so can feel but shame and pity when they see any man, born to the blessings of English citizenship, sinking to a moral level at which he becomes capable of attempting to move the noble power of Britain to abet the crime of once more imposing by fire and sword upon Italy the domination of the Pontiff; and who, indeed, even to that can add the second crime of endeavouring to throw back the families of this goodly realm to the same condition as that in which the people of the Papal States lay before their yoke was broken. These things would be mournful, but no more than mournful, did the guilt of them rest only upon one English soul in which still survived a clear consciousness of how repugnant they were to religion and to morals, how offensive to humanity, how subversive of good order; for when conscience still spoke, repentance might be at hand. But such things become more than sad, they become really formidable, when conscience itself is so warped that it learns to acquit them of all guilt,—learns even to regard them as actions in which the violence and bloodshed proposed are sanctioned by religion, and become works of Christian merit; and in which the changes contemplated would, if indeed hurtful to nations in things temporal, be for their eternal weal.

In the future, as in the past, it may be that colleges will be unfaithful to their trust; that clergymen will set before all England an example of how to equivocate with solemn public engagements; that politicians will be heedless and temporising;

that crowds will be half-consciously drawn on by the performances, sports, and charms which are ever the baits of spiritual and political thralldom ; but if so it is to be, then in the midst of it all hereafter, He who, in the midst of it all heretofore, has so ordered events that the Papacy has a numerically smaller proportion of our population now than it had thirty years ago, will by some means—by a *wind that bloweth where it listeth*—show that as He is the Author and the Finisher, so will He be Himself the Defender of the Faith. And in this land of manifold privilege hereafter, as in the time gone by, yea, more than in the time gone by, will the people fear God, honour the king, and prize the family Bible. They will hereafter, more than heretofore, send forth into every region under heaven their happy sons, bearing the glorious gospel of the blessed God, and with swift feet running to tell to all men the way of salvation ; yet meekly slow the while to say, in the case of any, what precise amount of erring opinion will necessarily render a man the proper object of the curse of a Christian, or will shut him out from the forgiving mercies of God. In England, in Ireland, and in Scotland ; in every place where our own blood flows in the veins of kinsmen ; in every broad State of the Transatlantic Union ; in every thriving colony that boasts the British name,—may the Churches dwell together in unity,—may the people grow in wisdom, in virtue, and in faith ! And as at present our own realm affords an example such as no commonwealth ever before presented, of the happy tempering and combination of those three elements which from the earliest days have, in all governments, civil and ecclesiastical, struggled with one another for the exclusive sway,—a combination which unites into one threefold cord an organised and powerful democracy, with an aristocracy solid and mighty, and a Crown exalted and obeyed,—so may this realm hereafter afford an example of laws being evermore ameliorated under the leavening influence of the kingdom which cannot be moved, of manners ever becoming purer, and of blest content-

ment growing, year after year, in households over every one of which shall hover the more than earthly charm of domestic bliss, hallowed at the family altar ! And may the remote descendants of Victoria and Albert reign, in the love of God and in the love of man, as Christian princes over a happy Christian people, and age after age may the throne be established in righteousness !

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN !

APPENDIX C.

THE CONSTITUTIONS 'DEI FILIUS' AND 'PASTOR ÆTERNUS.'

(From the 'Catholic Directory' for 1871, pp. 55 ff.)

DOGOMATIC CONSTITUTION ON THE CATHOLIC FAITH.

PIUS BISHOP, Servant of the servants of God, with the approval of the Sacred Council, for perpetual remembrance.

Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and Redeemer of mankind, before returning to His Heavenly Father, promised that He would be with the Church Militant on earth all days, even to the consummation of the world. Therefore He has never ceased to be present with His beloved Spouse, to assist her when teaching, to bless her when at work, and to aid her when in danger. And this His salutary providence, which has been constantly displayed by other innumerable benefits, has been most manifestly proved by the abundant good results which Christendom has derived from Ecumenical Councils, and particularly from that of Trent, although it was held in evil times. For, as a consequence, the sacred doctrines of the faith have been defined more closely and set forth more fully; errors have been condemned and restrained; ecclesiastical discipline has been restored and more firmly secured; the love of learning and of piety has been promoted among the clergy; colleges have been established to educate youth for the sacred warfare; and the morals of the Christian world have been renewed by the more accurate training of the faithful, and by the more frequent use of the sacraments. Moreover, there has resulted a closer communion of the members with the visible head, and an increase of vigour in the whole mystical body of Christ; the multiplication of religious congregations and of other institutions of Christian piety; and such ardour in extending the kingdom of Christ throughout the world, as constantly endures, even to the sacrifice of life itself.

But while we recall with due thankfulness these and other signal benefits which the divine mercy has bestowed on the Church, especially

by the last Ecumenical Council, we cannot restrain our bitter sorrow for the grave evils which are due principally to the fact, that the authority of that sacred Synod has been contemned, or its wise decrees neglected, by many.

No one is ignorant that the heresies proscribed by the Fathers of Trent, by which the divine teaching (*magisterium*) of the Church was rejected, and all matters regarding religion were surrendered to the judgment of each individual, gradually became dissolved into many sects, which disagreed and contended with one another, until at length not a few lost all faith in Christ. Even the Holy Scriptures, which had previously been declared sole source and judge of Christian doctrine, began to be held no longer as divine, but to be ranked among the fictions of mythology.

Then there arose, and too widely overspread the world, that doctrine of rationalism, or naturalism, which opposes itself in every way to the Christian religion as a supernatural institution, and works with the utmost zeal in order that, after Christ, our sole Lord and Saviour, has been excluded from the minds of men, and from the life and moral acts of nations, the reign of what they call pure reason or nature may be established. And after forsaking and rejecting the Christian religion, and denying the true God and His Christ, the minds of many have sunk into the abyss of Pantheism, Materialism, and Atheism, until, denying rational nature itself and every sound rule of right, they labour to destroy the deepest foundations of human society.

Unhappily, it has yet farther come to pass that, while this impiety prevailed on every side, many even of the children of the Catholic Church have strayed from the path of true piety; and by the gradual diminution of the truths they held, the Catholic sense has become weakened in them. For, led away by various and strange doctrines, wrongly confusing nature and grace, human science and divine faith, they are found to deprave the true sense of the doctrines which our Holy Mother Church holds and teaches, and to endanger the integrity and the soundness of the faith.

Considering these things, how can the Church fail to be deeply stirred? For, even as God wills all men to be saved, and to arrive at the knowledge of the truth; even as Christ came to save what had perished, and to gather together the children of God who had been dispersed; so the Church, constituted by God the mother and teacher of nations, knows its own office as debtor to all, and is ever ready and watchful to raise the fallen, to support those who are falling, to embrace those who return, to confirm the good and to carry them on to better things. Hence, it can never forbear from witnessing to and proclaiming the truth of God, which heals all things, knowing the words addressed to it: My Spirit that is in thee, and My words that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, from henceforth and for ever (Isaias lix. 21).

We, therefore, following the footsteps of our predecessors, have never

ceased, as becomes our supreme Apostolic office, from teaching and defending Catholic truth, and condemning doctrines of error. And now, with the Bishops of the whole world assembled round us and judging with us, congregated by our authority and in the Holy Spirit in this Ecumenical Council, we, supported by the word of God written and handed down, as we have received it from the Catholic Church, preserved with sacredness and set forth according to truth,—have determined to profess and declare the salutary teaching of Christ from this chair of Peter, and in sight of all, proscribing and condemning, by the power given to us of God, all errors contrary thereto.

Chap. I. Of God the Creator of all things.

The Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church believes and confesses that there is one true and living God, Creator and Lord of heaven and earth, Almighty, Eternal, Immense, Incomprehensible, Infinite in intelligence, in will, and in all perfection, who, as being one, sole, absolutely simple, and immutable spiritual substance, is to be declared as really and essentially distinct from the world, of supreme beatitude in and from Himself, and ineffably exalted above all things beside Himself which exist or are conceivable.

This one only true God, of His own goodness and almighty power, not for the increase or acquirement of His own happiness, but to manifest His perfection by the blessing which He bestows on creatures, and with absolute freedom of counsel, created out of nothing, from the beginning of time, both the spiritual and the corporeal creature, to wit, the angelical and the mundane; and afterwards the human creature, as partaking, in a sense, of both, consisting of spirit and body.¹

God protects and governs by His Providence all things which He hath made, ‘reaching from end to end mightily, and ordering all things sweetly’ (Wisdom viii. 1). For ‘all things are bare and open to His eyes’ (Heb. iv. 13), even those which are yet to be by the free action of creatures.

Chap. II. Of Revelation.

The same Holy Mother Church holds and teaches that God, the beginning and end of all things, may be certainly known by the natural light of human reason, by means of created things; ‘for the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made’ (Romans i. 20): but that it pleased His wisdom and bounty to reveal Himself, and the eternal decrees of His will, to mankind by another and supernatural way, as the Apostle says: ‘God, having spoken on divers occasions, and many ways, in times past, to the fathers by the prophets; last of all, in these days, hath spoken to us by His Son’ (Hebrews i. 1, 2).

¹ Fourth Lateran Council, cap. i. de fide Catholica.

It is to be ascribed to this divine revelation, that such truths among things divine as of themselves are not beyond human reason can, even in the present condition of mankind, be known by every one with facility, with firm assurance, and with no admixture of error. This, however, is not the reason why revelation is to be called absolutely necessary ; but because God of His infinite goodness has ordained man to a supernatural end, viz., to be a sharer of divine blessings which utterly exceed the intelligence of the human mind : for ‘ eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love Him ’ (1 Cor. ii. 2).

Further, this supernatural revelation, according to the universal belief of the Church, declared by the Sacred Synod of Trent, is contained in the written books and unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself, or by the Apostles themselves, from the dictation of the Holy Spirit, transmitted, as it were, from hand to hand, have come down even unto us.¹ And these books of the Old and New Testament are to be received as sacred and canonical, in their integrity, with all their parts, as they are enumerated in the decree of the said Council, and are contained in the ancient Latin edition of the Vulgate. These the Church holds to be sacred and canonical : not because, having been carefully composed by mere human industry, they were afterwards approved by her authority ; nor merely because they contain revelation, with no admixture of error ; but because, having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their author, and have been delivered as such to the Church herself.

And as the things which, in order to curb rebellious spirits, the Holy Synod of Trent decreed for the good of souls concerning the interpretation of Divine Scripture, have been wrongly explained by some, We, renewing the said decree, declare this to be its meaning : that, in matters of faith and morals, appertaining to the building up of Christian doctrine, that is to be held as the true sense of Holy Scripture which our Holy Mother Church hath held and holds, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scripture ; and therefore that it is permitted to no one to interpret the Sacred Scripture contrary to this sense, or, likewise, contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

Chap. III. On Faith.

Man being wholly dependent upon God, as upon his Creator and Lord, and created reason being absolutely subject to uncreated truth, we are bound to yield to God, by faith in His revelation, the full obedience of our intelligence and will. And the Catholic Church teaches that this faith, which is the beginning of man’s salvation, is a supernatural virtue, whereby, inspired and assisted by the grace of God, we believe

¹ Council of Trent, sess. iv. de Can Script.

that the things which He has revealed are true : not because the intrinsic truth of the things is plainly perceived by the natural light of reason, but because of the authority of God Himself who reveals them, and who can neither be deceived nor deceive. For faith, as the Apostle testifies, is 'the substance of things hoped for, the conviction of things that appear not' (Hebrews xi. 1).

Nevertheless, in order that the obedience of our faith might be in harmony with reason, God willed that to the interior help of the Holy Spirit there should be joined exterior proofs of His revelation : to wit, divine facts, and especially miracles and prophecies, which, as they manifestly display the omnipotence and infinite knowledge of God, are most certain proofs of His divine revelation, adapted to the intelligence of all men. Wherefore, both Moses and the Prophets, and most especially Christ our Lord Himself, showed forth many and most evident miracles and prophecies ; and of the Apostles we read : 'But they going forth preached everywhere, the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed' (Mark xvi. 20). And again it is written : 'We have the more firm prophetical word, whereunto you do well to attend, as to a light shining in a dark place' (2 St. Peter i. 19).

But though the assent of faith is by no means a blind action of the mind, still no man can assent to the Gospel teaching, as is necessary to obtain salvation, without the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who gives to all men sweetness in assenting to and believing in the truth.¹ Wherefore faith itself, even when it does not work by charity, is in itself a gift of God, and the act of faith is a work appertaining to salvation, by which man yields voluntary obedience to God Himself, by assenting to and co-operating with His grace, which he is able to resist.

Further, all those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the Word of God, written or handed down, and which the Church, either by a solemn judgment or by her ordinary and universal teaching (*magisterium*), proposes for belief as having been divinely revealed.

And since without faith it is impossible to please God, and to attain to the fellowship of His children, therefore without faith no one has ever attained justification ; nor will any one obtain eternal life, unless he shall have persevered in faith unto the end. And, that we may be able to satisfy the obligation of embracing the true faith and of constantly persevering in it, God has instituted the Church through His only-begotten Son, and has bestowed on it manifest notes of that institution, that it may be recognised by all men as the guardian and teacher of the revealed Word ; for to the Catholic Church alone belong all those many and

¹ Second Council of Orange, confirmed by Pope Boniface II., A.D. 529, against the Semipelagians, can. vii. See Denzinger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, p. 50. Würzburg, 1854.

admirable tokens which have been divinely established for the evident credibility of the Christian Faith. Nay, more, the Church by itself, by reason of its marvellous extension, its eminent holiness, and its inexhaustible fruitfulness in every good thing, its Catholic unity and its invincible stability, is a great and perpetual motive of credibility, and an irrefutable witness of its own divine mission.

And thus, like a standard set up unto the nations (*Isaias xi. 12*), it both invites to itself those who do not yet believe, and assures its children that the faith which they profess rests on the most firm foundation. And its testimony is efficaciously supported by a power from on high. For our most merciful Lord gives His grace to stir up and to aid those who are astray, that they may come to a knowledge of the truth; and to those whom He has brought out of darkness into His own admirable light, He gives His grace to strengthen them to persevere in that light, deserting none who desert not Him. Therefore there is no parity between the condition of those who have adhered to the Catholic truth by the heavenly gift of faith, and of those who, led by human opinions, follow a false religion; for those who have received the faith under the teaching (*magisterio*) of the Church can never have any just cause for changing or doubting that faith. Therefore, giving thanks to God the Father who has made us worthy to be partakers of the lot of the Saints in light, let us not neglect so great salvation, but with our eyes fixed on Jesus, the author and finisher of our Faith, let us hold fast the confession of our hope without wavering (*Hebrews xii. 2* and *x. 23*).

Chap. IV. Of Faith and Reason.

The Catholic Church with one consent has also ever held and does hold that there is a twofold order of knowledge, distinct both in principle and in object: in principle, because our knowledge in the one is by natural reason, and in the other by divine faith; in object, because, besides those things to which natural reason can attain, there are proposed to our belief mysteries hidden in God, which, unless divinely revealed, cannot be known. Wherefore the Apostle, who testifies that God is known by the gentiles through created things, still, when discoursing of the grace and truth which come by Jesus Christ (*John i. 17*), says: ‘We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, a wisdom which is hidden, which God ordained before the world unto our glory: which none of the princes of this world knew; . . . but to us God hath revealed them by His Spirit. For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God’ (*1 Cor. ii. 7-9*). And the only-begotten Son Himself gives thanks to the Father, because He has hid these things from the wise and prudent, and has revealed them to little ones (*Matt. xi. 25*).

Reason, indeed, enlightened by faith, when it seeks earnestly, piously, and calmly, attains by a gift from God some, and that a very fruitful, understanding of mysteries; partly from the analogy of those things

which it naturally knows, partly from the relations which the mysteries bear to one another and to the last end of man : but reason never becomes capable of apprehending mysteries as it does those truths which constitute its proper object. For the divine mysteries by their own nature so far transcend the created intelligence that, even when delivered by revelation and received by faith, they remain covered with the veil of faith itself, and shrouded in a certain degree of darkness, so long as we are pilgrims in this mortal life, not yet with God ; ‘for we walk by faith and not by sight’ (2 Cor. v. 7).

But although faith is above reason, there can never be any real discrepancy between faith and reason ; since the same God who reveals mysteries and infuses faith has bestowed the light of reason on the human mind, and God cannot deny Himself, nor can truth ever contradict truth. The false appearance of such a contradiction is mainly due, either to the dogmas of faith not having been understood and expounded according to the mind of the Church, or to the inventions of opinion having been taken for the verdicts of reason. We define, therefore, that every assertion contrary to a truth of enlightened faith is utterly false.¹ Further, the Church, which, together with the Apostolic office of teaching, has received a charge to guard the deposit of faith, derives from God the right and the duty of proscribing false science, lest any should be deceived by philosophy and vain fallacy (Col. ii. 8). Therefore all faithful Christians are not only forbidden to defend, as legitimate conclusions of science, such opinions as are known to be contrary to the doctrines of faith, especially if they have been condemned by the Church, but are altogether bound to account them as errors which put on the fallacious appearance of truth.

And not only can faith and reason never be opposed to one another, but they are of mutual aid one to the other : for right reason demonstrates the foundations of faith, and, enlightened by its light, cultivates the science of things divine ; while faith frees and guards reason from errors, and furnishes it with manifold knowledge. So far, therefore, is the Church from opposing the cultivation of human arts and sciences, that it in many ways helps and promotes it. For the Church neither ignores nor despises the benefits to human life which result from the arts and sciences, but confesses that, as they came from God, the Lord of all science, so, if they be rightly used, they lead to God by the help of His grace. Nor does the Church forbid that each of these sciences in its sphere should make use of its own principles and its own method ; but, while recognising this just liberty, it stands watchfully on guard, lest sciences, setting themselves against the divine teaching, or transgressing their own limits, should invade and disturb the domain of faith.

¹ From the Bull of Pope Leo X., *Apostolici regiminis*, read in the viii. session of the Fifth Lateran Council, A.D. 1513. See Labb 's Councils, vol. xix., p. 842. Venice, 1732.

For the doctrine of faith which God hath revealed has not been proposed, like a philosophical invention, to be perfected by human ingenuity; but has been delivered as a divine deposit to the Spouse of Christ, to be faithfully kept and infallibly declared. Hence also, that meaning of the sacred dogmas is perpetually to be retained which our Holy Mother the Church has once declared; nor is that meaning ever to be departed from, under the pretence or pretext of a deeper comprehension of them. Let, then, the intelligence, science, and wisdom of each and all, of individuals and of the whole Church, in all ages and all times, increase and flourish in abundance and vigour; but simply in its own proper kind, that is to say, in one and the same doctrine, one and the same sense, one and the same judgment (*Vincent of Lerins, Common. n. 28*).

CANONS.

I. *Of God the Creator of all things.*

1. If any one shall deny One true God, Creator and Lord of things visible and invisible; let him be anathema.
2. If any one shall not be ashamed to affirm that, except matter, nothing exists; let him be anathema.
3. If any one shall say that the substance and essence of God and of all things is one and the same; let him be anathema.
4. If any one shall say that finite things, both corporeal and spiritual, or at least spiritual, have emanated from the divine substance; or that the divine essence by the manifestation and evolution of itself becomes all things; or, lastly, that God is universal or indefinite being, which by determining itself constitutes the universality of things, distinct according to kinds (*genera*), species, and individuals; let him be anathema.
5. If any one confess not that the world, and all things which are contained in it, both spiritual and material, have been, in their whole substance, produced by God out of nothing; or shall say that God created, not by His will, free from all necessity, but by a necessity equal to the necessity whereby He loves Himself; or shall deny that the world was made for the glory of God; let him be anathema.

II. *Of Revelation.*

1. If any one shall say that the One true God, our Creator and Lord, cannot be certainly known by the natural light of human reason, through created things; let him be anathema.
2. If any one shall say that it is impossible, or inexpedient, that man should be taught by divine revelation concerning God and the worship to be paid to Him; let him be anathema.
3. If any one shall say that man cannot be raised by divine power to a higher than natural knowledge and perfection, but can and ought, by

a continuous progress, to arrive at length, of himself, to the possession of all that is true and good ; let him be anathema.

4. If any one shall not receive as sacred and canonical the Books of Holy Scripture, entire with all their parts, as the Holy Synod of Trent has enumerated them, or shall deny that they have been divinely inspired ; let him be anathema.

III. Of Faith.

1. If any one shall say that human reason is so independent that faith cannot be enjoined upon it by God ; let him be anathema.

2. If any one shall say that divine faith is not distinguished from natural knowledge of God and of moral truths, and therefore that it is not requisite for divine faith that revealed truth be believed because of the authority of God who reveals it ; let him be anathema.

3. If any one shall say that divine revelation cannot be made credible by outward signs, and therefore that men ought to be moved to faith solely by the internal experience of each, or by private inspiration ; let him be anathema.

4. If any one shall say that miracles are impossible, and therefore that all the accounts regarding them, even those contained in Holy Scripture, are to be dismissed as fabulous or mythical ; or that miracles can never be known with certainty, and that the divine origin of Christianity is not rightly proved by them ; let him be anathema.

5. If any one shall say that the assent of Christian faith is not a free act, but necessarily produced by the arguments of human reason ; or that the grace of God is necessary for that living faith only which worketh by charity ; let him be anathema.

6. If any one shall say that the condition of the faithful, and of those who have not yet attained to the only true faith, is on a par, so that Catholics may have just cause for doubting, with suspended assent, the faith which they have already received under the teaching (*magisterio*) of the Church, until they shall have obtained a scientific demonstration of the credibility and truth of their faith ; let him be anathema.

IV. Of Faith and Reason.

1. If any one shall say that in divine revelation there are no mysteries, truly and properly so called, but that all the doctrines of faith can be understood and demonstrated from natural principles by properly cultivated reason ; let him be anathema.

2. If any one shall say that human sciences are to be so freely treated, that their assertions, although opposed to revealed doctrine, can be held as true, and cannot be condemned by the Church ; let him be anathema.

3. If any one shall assert it to be possible that sometimes, according to the progress of science, a sense is to be given to doctrines propounded by the Church different from that which the Church has understood and understands ; let him be anathema.

Therefore We, fulfilling the duty of our supreme pastoral office, entreat by the mercies of Jesus Christ, and, by the authority of the same our God and Saviour, We command, all the faithful of Christ, and especially those who are set over others or are charged with the office of instruction, that they earnestly and diligently apply themselves to ward off and eliminate these errors from Holy Church, and to spread the light of pure faith.

And since it is not sufficient to shun heretical gravity, unless those errors also be diligently avoided which more or less nearly approach it, We admonish all men of the further duty of observing the Constitutions and Decrees by which such erroneous opinions as are not here expressly enumerated have been proscribed and condemned by this Holy See.

Given at Rome in Public Session, solemnly held in the Vatican Basilica in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the twenty-fourth day of April, in the twenty-fourth year of our Pontificate.

In conformity with the original,

JOSEPH, *Bishop of St. Polten,
Secretary of the Vatican Council.*

FIRST DOGMATIC CONSTITUTION ON THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

PIUS BISHOP, Servant of the servants of God, with the approval of the Sacred Council, for perpetual remembrance.

The Eternal Pastor and Bishop of our souls, in order to continue for all time the life-giving work of His Redemption, determined to build up the Holy Church, wherein, as in the House of the living God, all who believe might be united in the bond of one faith and one charity. Wherefore, before He entered into His glory, He prayed unto the Father, not for the Apostles only, but for those also who through their preaching should come to believe in Him, that all might be one, even as He the Son and the Father are one (St. John xvi. 21). As then He sent the Apostles whom He had chosen to Himself from the world, as He Himself had been sent by the Father; so He willed that there should ever be pastors and teachers in His Church to the end of the world. And in order that the Episcopate also might be one and undivided, and that by means of a closely united priesthood the multitude of the faithful might be kept secure in the oneness of faith and communion, He set Blessed Peter over the rest of the Apostles, and fixed in him the abiding principle of this two-fold unity and its visible foundation, in the strength of which the everlasting temple should arise, and the Church in the firmness of that faith should lift her majestic front to heaven.¹ And seeing that the gates of hell with daily increase of hatred are gathering their strength on every side to upheave the foundation laid by God's own hand, and so, if

¹ From Sermon IV., chap. ii., of St. Leo the Great, A.D. 440, vol. i., p. 17, of edition of Ballerini, Venice, 1753: read in the eighth lection on the Feast of St. Peter's Chair at Antioch, February 22nd.

that might be, to overthrow the Church : We, therefore, for the preservation, safe keeping, and increase of the Catholic flock, with the approval of the Sacred Council, do judge it to be necessary to propose to the belief and acceptance of all the faithful, in accordance with the ancient and constant faith of the universal Church, the doctrine touching the institution, perpetuity, and nature of the sacred Apostolic Primacy, in which is found the strength and solidity of the entire Church ; and at the same time to proscribe and condemn the contrary errors, so hurtful to the flock of Christ.

Chap. I. Of the Institution of the Apostolic Primacy in Blessed Peter.

We therefore teach and declare that, according to the testimony of the Gospel, the primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church of God was immediately and directly promised and given to Blessed Peter the Apostle by Christ the Lord. For it was to Simon alone, to whom He had already said, ‘Thou shalt be called Cephas’ (St. John i. 42), that the Lord, after the confession made by him, saying, ‘Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,’ addressed these solemn words : ‘Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood have not revealed it to thee, but My Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church ; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt lose on earth, it shall be loosed in heaven’ (St. Matthew xvi. 16-19). And it was upon Simon alone that Jesus after His resurrection bestowed the jurisdiction of Chief Pastor and Ruler over all His fold in the words : ‘Feed My lambs ; feed My sheep’ (St. John xxi. 15-17). At open variance with this clear doctrine of Holy Scripture, as it has been ever understood by the Catholic Church, are the perverse opinions of those who, while they distort the form of government established by Christ the Lord in His Church, deny that Peter in his single person, preferably to all the other Apostles, whether taken separately or together, was endowed by Christ with a true and proper primacy of jurisdiction ; or of those who assert that the same primacy was not bestowed immediately and directly upon Blessed Peter himself, but upon the Church, and through the Church on Peter as her minister.

If any one, therefore, shall say that Blessed Peter the Apostle was not appointed the Prince of all the Apostles and the visible Head of the whole Church Militant ; or that the same directly and immediately received from the same our Lord Jesus Christ a primacy of honour only, and not of true and proper jurisdiction ; let him be anathema.

Chap. II. On the Perpetuity of the Primacy of Blessed Peter in the Roman Pontiffs.

That which the Prince of Shepherds and Great Shepherd of the sheep, Jesus Christ our Lord, established in the person of the Blessed Apostle

Peter, to secure the perpetual welfare and lasting good of the Church, must, by the same institution, necessarily remain unceasingly in the Church ; which, being founded upon the Rock, will stand firm to the end of the world. For none can doubt, and it is known to all ages, that the holy and Blessed Peter, the Prince and Chief of the Apostles, the pillar of the faith and foundation of the Catholic Church, received the keys of the kingdom from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of mankind, and lives, presides, and judges, to this day and always, in his successors the Bishops of the Holy See of Rome, which was founded by him, and consecrated by his blood.¹ Whence, whosoever succeeds to Peter in this See does by the institution of Christ Himself obtain the Primacy of Peter over the whole Church. This disposition made by Incarnate Truth (*dispositio veritatis*) therefore remains, and Blessed Peter abiding in the rock strength which he received (*in acceptâ fortitudine petrâ perseverans*), has not abandoned the direction of the Church.² Wherefore it has at all times been necessary that every particular Church —that is to say, the faithful throughout the world—should come to the Church of Rome, on account of the greater principedom it has received ; so that in this See, whence the rights of venerable communion spread to all, they might, as members joined together in their head, grow closely into one body.³

If, then, one shall say that it is not by the institution of Christ the Lord, or by divine right, that Blessed Peter has a perpetual line of successors in the primacy over the universal Church ; or that the Roman Pontiff is not the successor of Blessed Peter in this primacy ; let him be anathema.

*Chap. III. On the Power and Nature of the Primacy of the
Roman Pontiff.*

Wherefore, resting on plain testimonies of the Sacred Writings, and adhering to the plain and express decrees both of our predecessors the Roman Pontiffs, and of the General Councils, We renew the definition of the Ecumenical Council of Florence, by which all the faithful of Christ must believe that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff possesses the primacy over the whole world ; and that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and is true Vicar of Christ, and Head of the whole Church, and Father and Teacher of

¹ From the Acts (session third) of the Third General Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. Labb 's Councils, vol. iii., p. 1154, Venice edition of 1728. See also letter of St. Peter Chrysologus to Eutyches, in life prefixed to his works, p. 18, Venice, 1750.

² From Sermon III., chap. iii., of St. Leo the Great, vol. i., p. xii.

³ From St. Irenaeus again Heresies, Book III., cap. iii., p. 175, Benedictine edition, Venice, 1734 ; and Acts of Synod of Aquileia, A.D. 381, Labb 's Councils, vol. ii., p. 1185, Venice, 1728.

all Christians ; and that full power was given to him in Blessed Peter, by Jesus Christ our Lord, to rule, feed, and govern the Universal Church : as is also contained in the Acts of the Ecumenical Councils and in the Sacred Canons.

Hence we teach and declare, that by the appointment of our Lord the Roman Church possesses a sovereignty of ordinary power over all other Churches, and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate ; to which all, of whatever rite and dignity, both pastors and faithful, both individually and collectively, are bound, by their duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, to submit, not only in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world ; so that the Church of Christ may be one flock under one supreme Pastor, through the preservation of unity, both of communion and of profession of the same faith, with the Roman Pontiff. This is the teaching of Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and of salvation.

But so far is this power of the Supreme Pontiff from being any prejudice to that ordinary and immediate power of episcopal jurisdiction, by which Bishops, who have been set by the Holy Ghost to succeed and hold the place of the Apostles, feed and govern each his own flock, as true pastors, that this same power is really asserted, strengthened, and protected by the supreme and universal Pastor ; in accordance with the words of St. Gregory the Great : ‘ My honour is the honour of the whole Church. My honour is the firm strength of my brethren. Then am I truly honoured, when the honour due to each and all is not withheld.’¹

Further, from this supreme power possessed by the Roman Pontiff of governing the universal Church, it follows that, in the exercise of this office, he has the right of free communication with the pastors of the whole Church, and with their flocks, that they may be taught and ruled by him in the way of salvation. Wherefore We condemn and reprobate the opinions of those who hold that the communication between the supreme Head and the pastors and their flocks can lawfully be impeded ; or who make this communication subject to the will of the secular power, so as to maintain that whatever is done by the Apostolic See, or by its authority, for the government of the Church, cannot have force or value unless it be confirmed by the assent of the secular power. And since, by the divine right of Apostolic primacy, the Roman Pontiff is placed over the universal Church, We further teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful,² and that in all causes the decision of which belongs

¹ From chap. iv. of xxiii. session of Council of Trent, ‘ Of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy.’

² From the Letters of St. Gregory the Great, Book VIII. 30, vol. ii., p. 919. Benedictine edition, Paris, 1705.

³ From a Brief of Pius VI., *Super soliditate*, of November 28th, 1786.

to the Church recourse may be had to his tribunal ;¹ but that none may re-open the judgment of the Apostolic See, than whose authority there is no greater, nor can any lawfully review its judgment.² Wherefore they err from the right path of truth who assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the Roman Pontiff to an Ecumenical Council, as to an authority higher than that of the Roman Pontiff.

If then any shall say that the Roman Pontiff has the office merely of inspection or direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church, not only in things which belong to faith and morals, but also in those which relate to the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the world ; or assert that he possesses merely the principal part, and not all the fulness of this supreme power ; or that this power which he enjoys is not ordinary and immediate, both over each and all the Churches, and over each and all the pastors and the faithful ; let him be anathema.

Chap. IV. Concerning the Infallible Teaching of the Roman Pontiff.

Moreover, that the supreme power of teaching (*magisterii*) is also included in the Apostolic primacy, which the Roman Pontiff, as the successor of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, possesses over the whole Church, this Holy See has always held, the perpetual practice of the Church confirms, and Ecumenical Councils also have declared, especially those in which the East with the West met in the union of faith and charity. For the Fathers of the Fourth Council of Constantinople, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, gave forth this solemn profession : The first condition of salvation is to keep the rule of the true faith. And because the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed by, who said, ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build My Church’ (St. Matthew xvi. 18), these things which have been said are proved by events, because in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has always been kept undefiled and her well-known doctrine has been kept holy. Desiring, therefore, not to be in the least degree separated from the faith and doctrine of this See, we hope that we may deserve to be in the one communion, which the Apostolic See preaches, in which is the entire and true solidity of the Christian religion.³ And, with the approval of the Second Council of Lyons, the Greeks professed : That the Holy Roman Church enjoys supreme and full Primacy and princedom over the whole Catholic Church, which it truly and humbly acknowledges that it has received with the plenitude of power from our Lord Himself in the person

¹ From the Acts of the Fourteenth General Council of Lyons, A.D. 1274. Labb 's Councils, vol. xiv., p. 512.

² From Letter VIII of Pope Nicholas I., A.D. 858, to the Emperor Michael, in Labb 's Councils, vol. ix., pp. 1339 and 1570.

³ From the Formula of St. Hormisdas, subscribed by the Fathers of the Eighth General Council (Fourth of Constantinople), A.D. 869. Labb 's Councils, vol. v., pp. 683, 622.

of Blessed Peter, Prince or Head of the Apostles, whose successor the Roman Pontiff is ; and as the Apostolic See is bound before all others to defend the truth of faith, so also, if any questions regarding faith shall arise, they must be defined by its judgment.¹ Finally, the Council of Florence defined :² That the Roman Pontiff is the true Vicar of Christ, and the Head of the whole Church, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians ; and that to him in Blessed Peter was delivered by our Lord Jesus Christ the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the whole Church (John xxi. 15-17).

To satisfy this pastoral duty, our predecessors ever made unwearied efforts that the salutary doctrine of Christ might be propagated among all the nations of the earth, and with equal care watched that it might be preserved genuine and pure where it had been received. Therefore the Bishops of the whole world, now singly, now assembled in synod, following the long-established custom of Churches³ and the form of the ancient rule,⁴ sent word to this Apostolic See of those dangers especially which sprang up in matters of faith, that there the losses of faith might be most effectually repaired where the faith cannot fail.⁵ And the Roman Pontiffs, according to the exigencies of times and circumstances, sometimes assembling OEcumenical Councils, or asking for the mind of the Church scattered throughout the world, sometimes by particular Synods, sometimes using other helps which Divine Providence supplied, defined as to be held those things which with the help of God they had recognised as conformable with the Sacred Scriptures and Apostolic Traditions. For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter, that by His revelation they might make known new doctrine, but that by His assistance they might inviolably keep and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the Apostles. And indeed all the venerable Fathers have embraced and the holy orthodox Doctors have venerated and followed their Apostolic doctrine ; knowing most fully that this See of Saint Peter remains ever free from all blemish of error according to the divine promise of the Lord our Saviour made to the Prince of His disciples : 'I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren' (St. Luke xxii. 32).⁶

¹ From the Acts of the Fourteenth General Council (Second of Lyons), A.D. 1274. Labb , vol. xiv., p. 512.

² From the Acts of the Seventeenth General Council of Florence, A.D. 1438. Labb , vol. xviii., p. 526.

³ From a Letter of St. Cyril of Alexandria to Pope St. Celestine I., A.D., 422, vol. vi., part ii., p. 36, Paris edition of 1638.

⁴ From a Rescript of St. Innocent I. to the Council of Milevis, A.D. 402. Labb , vol. iii., p. 47.

⁵ From a Letter of St. Bernard to Pope Innocent II., A.D. 1130. Epist. 191, vol. iv., p. 433, Paris edition of 1742.

⁶ See also the Acts of the Sixth General Council, A.D. 680. Labb , vol. vii., 659.

This gift, then, of truth and never-failing faith, was conferred by Heaven upon Peter and his successors in this Chair, that they might perform their high office for the salvation of all; that the whole flock of Christ, kept away by them from the poisonous food of error, might be nourished with the pasture of heavenly doctrine; that, the occasion of schism being removed, the whole Church might be kept one, and, resting on its foundation, might stand firm against the gates of hell.

But since in this very age, in which the salutary efficacy of the Apostolic office is most of all required, not a few are found who take away from its authority, we judge it altogether necessary solemnly to assert the prerogative which the only-begotten Son of God vouchsafed to join with the supreme pastoral office.

Therefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic Religion, and the salvation of Christian people, with the approval of the Sacred Council, We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: That the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of Pastor and Teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, is, by the divine assistance promised to Him in Blessed Peter, possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed in defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church, irreformable.¹

But if any one, which may God avert! presume to contradict this our Definition; let him be anathema.

Given at Rome in Public Session, solemnly held in the Vatican Basilica in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the eighteenth day of July, in the twenty-fifth year of our Pontificate.

In conformity with the original,

JOSEPH, Bishop of St. Polten,
Secretary to the Vatican Council.

¹ That is, in the words used by Pope Nicholas I., Note 18, and in the Synod of Quedlinburg, A.D. 1085, 'it is allowed to none to révise its judgment, and to sit in judgment upon what it has judged.' Labbé, vol. xii., p. 679.

APPENDIX D.

THE POPE PERSONALLY PREPARING CHILDREN FOR WAR.

The *Times* of Tuesday, 29th February, 1876, has the following :—

'The Vatican *Voce Della Verità* gives an account of a reception by the Pope of foreign families, recent converts to the Church, and mostly English and Americans. The Pope took particular notice of a little boy, six years old, the child of Mr. William Hutchinson, a graduate of Oxford. The child was dressed as a Pontifical Switzer, and offered the military salute. The Pope smilingly took hold of his baton, and said, "Where is your halberd, Switzer?" To which the child spiritedly said, "Holy Father, I hope if God gives me health when I grow up to carry your Holiness's banner." The Pope stooping down, and imitating the beating of a drum with his hand, said it was necessary to begin by beating the drum, and added, "God bless you, Switzer, and preserve you to defend the Holy See in His own good time." He addressed some affectionate words to the parents and all present.'

I N D E X.

Acclamation, Acton on, i., 109; Plan-tier on, i., 299; fears of, at first session, ii., 31; Manning on, ii., 37; De Luca on, ii., 100; again suggested, ii., 234, 235; checked by American bishops, ii., 245.

Acton, Lord, on counsel given by cardinals, i., 80; on the seventeen questions, i., 173; view of Antonelli, i., 341; on the views of the Curia, i., 342, 343; on secrecy, ii., 109; on how information leaked out, ii., 111.

Allzog, Dr., opposes infallibility, i., 292.

Anointing, respective signification of that of kings and bishops, i., 68.

Antonelli, Cardinal, Newman's notion of as to Syllabus, i., 184; answers Schwarzenberg, i., 260; his position towards the Council, ii., 79; reply to Beust, ii., 196; reply to Daru, ii., 199.

Aristocracy, in Papal States, i., 145; no career open to, *id.*; old not to be restored in new theocracy, ii., 94.

Armenians, in Rome, arrests, interdict, and flight from monastery, ii., 273-277.

Arnim, Count, to Bismarck, i., 265; his view of Council, i., 189; acts as mediator, ii., 428.

Audu, Patriarch of Babylon, speech of, ii., 121; ordered alone to the Vatican, ii., 121; night scene with the Pope, ii., 213-216.

Austrian bishops refuse to keep the law, i., 303.

Babylon, Patriarch of, *see AUDU.*

Baptism, political effects of, i., 67, 116; ii., 115, 116.

Bell, for Presidents, mystic symbols on, snake assailing bark of St. Peter, i., 350.

Bellarmino, his dispute with Sixtus V., i., 179; on bishops opposing Pope, ii., 142.

Beust, Count, Austrian minister, reply to Hohenlohe, i., 263; despatch to Rome, ii., 195; reply to Antonelli, ii., 197; defines the position of the State, ii., 204.

Bianchi, Procurator-General of the Dominicans, sermon in St. Peter's preceding the Council, i., 358.

Bishops, relation of, to the Pope, i., 103; his prefects, i., 104; bearing discordant testimony to the faith, i., 337; superior to princes, i., 68; disabilities of, in the Council, ii., 60, 64, 72, 84, 111, 144, 145, 146, 151, 166, 221, 223; memoranda of, on proposed decrees, ii., 293; their oath, ii., 371.

Bismarck, to Arnim on relations of Vatican and Germany, ii., 122.

Blacas, Duke of, the Crusader, his death and exemption from purgatory, i., 220.

Bull, convoking Council, i., 208; limiting censures (*Apostolice Sedis*), ii., 75; hierarchical, fiscal, and political aspects of this Bull, ii., 75-78; suspending Council, ii., 435.

Campagna, the, i., 121.

Canon Law, the common law of a country with or without consent of its Parliament, i., 64, 297; ought to be the law of the State, i., 306.

Canons, the famous twenty-one published, and consequent alarm, ii., 180, ff.; new and all-important one, first proposed by guile and next forced through, i., 362.

Cardinals ordered to write secret notes as to the question of a future Council, i., 2; contents of notes, i., 77-80.

Catechism, changes in, ii., 216 ff.; vote upon the new, ii., 292.

Cecconi, Archbishop of Florence, subject of his history, i., 2.

Church and State, subordination of State, i., 22, ff., 52, 53, 67, 275, 280, 364; ii., 80, 189, 202, 344; ideal of such subordination realised in Papal States, i., 117; separation of one from the other deprecated by Rome, i., 114.

Church, right of, to inflict pains and penalties, i., 23, 51, 69, 70, 192; Montalembert on, i., 226; Lacordaire forced to profess, i., 235; embodied in the Inquisition, i., 346;—consent of, to dogmas declared unnecessary, ii., 383.

Civilisation, means the civil system, i., 16; Christian civilisation means Pope over all princes, i., 51.

Civiltà Cattolica, commencement of, i., 14; its mission, i., 15; first manifesto, i., 15 ff.; on Syllabus, i., 54; quoted, *passim*.

Clergy, morals and training of, i., 243; ii., 159 ff., 171, 172.

Collingridge, Arthur, English Crusader, i., 206.

Comma, vote upon, ii., 250.

Commissions, six secret ones at work, i., 260.

Communication of Pope with the faithful, what is meant by, i., 30; ii., 80, 344.

Concordats, i., 293; not contracts but laws given by the Pope, i., 295.

Council, Vatican, first formal preparations, i., 2; notes of cardinals upon, i., 77-80; of selected bishops upon, i., 88 ff.; preparations for, interrupted by Sadowa, i., 98; postponed in 1867, i., 99; publicly intimated, i., 165; objects and composition of, ii., 238; fears of political effects, i., 246; manifestoes preparatory to, i., 249, 272, 279, 285; first session, ii., 1-44; second session, ii., 124; third session, ii., 278; catholicity of, questioned, ii., 297; fourth session of, ii., 398; *see PROCEDURE, Rules of.*

Creed, that of Pius IV. altered the decrees of Trent, i., 191; a new one read at Vatican Council, ii., 127; old and new together, ii., 129.

Crotti, Count, refuses to take the oaths to Italy, i., 108.

Crusade of St. Peter, consecrating weapons on the altar, i., 178;

efficiency of Crusaders, i., 196; religious incitements to, i., 197, 348; tales of, i., 204; the Pope in camp, i., 218; preaching the Crusade, i., 219; Crusaders exempt from purgatory, i., 221; Allet's order, i., 250; at Bagnorea, i., 361; France commanded for, ii., 358, to subdue the world, ii., 423; Crusaders leave Rome, ii., 481.

Darboy, Archbishop of Paris, reprimand of, i., 104; discusses whether a Liberal prince may or may not be absolved, i., 227; refuted at Rome, i., 227; his forecast of perils in the Council, i., 323; speaks, ii., 163; a speech of, in full, ii., 316.

Daru, Count, minister of France, opinions of, ii., 147; threatens to withdraw French garrison, ii., 192; important despatch, ii., 198; reply to Antonelli, ii., 201 ff.; suddenly retires, ii., 211.

Death, good hope in for Cardinals, ii., 116; less hope for bishops, ii., 117.

Decrees, purport of those of Vatican Council, ii., 246; conclusion to first imposed, ii., 248; Canon in second imposed, ii., 362; text of, Appendix C, ii.

Deposing kings, power of, i., 69-70.

Directing Congregation, secret proceedings of, i., 239; spends ten months in preparing Rules, i., 381; deprives bishops of right of proposing measures, enforces secrecy, holds fifty meetings, i., 585 ff.

Direct power and indirect, doctrine of, i., 179; ii., 200.

Discussion not anticipated by the Curia, ii., 82-92.

Döllinger, his position and reputation, i., 259; abused by Ultramontanes, ii., 170, 225; his first open manifesto, ii., 173; addresses to, ii., 224; declares that majorities cannot make dogmas, ii., 239.

Dufournel, two brothers, Crusaders, their martyrdom and honours, i., 269 ff.

Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans, his manifesto, i., 323-330; lectured by Deschamps, i., 330; reply to Deschamps, i., 176; refused the *imprimatur* in Rome, i., 173; personal attacks upon, ii., 209.

Encyclical of December 8th, 1864, i., 5.

Excommunication blasts the soul, according to Pius IX., i., 40.

Faculties, Quinquennial, i., 75, 102, 245.

Falcimagne, Abbé, contends that a Liberal prince may not be absolved, i., 231.

Florence abused by Veuillot, i., 112.

Free Church in a Free State, origin of the phrase, i., 41; what Free Church means, i., 63, 167.

Freemasons denounced, i., 105.

Friedrich, Professor, replies to Manning, i., 336; his *Tagebuch*, i., 355; his journey, i., 356, 357; on program, ii., 55; on decrees on faith, ii., 88; on Jesuits, ii., 108; on Roman monks, ii., 141; on morals of the clergy, ii., 159 ff.; his internal conflict, ii., 227; on decree on infallibility, ii., 229; on the inevitable sunbeam, ii., 302.

German bishops, ambiguous manifesto of, at Fulda, i., 299; dismissed by Nardi, ii., 86, 88; on infallibility, ii., 152.

German language, put out of priests' schools, i., 282.

German notables (Catholic), meeting of, in Berlin, i., 301.

Goldoni, the Crusader, his death and exemption from purgatory, i., 221.

Governments, proper place of in education, i., 18; warned by Manning, i., 334; by *Civilis*, ii., 94; their duty as to infallibility ii., 206.

Gratry, Father, letters of, ii., 169.

Guidi, Cardinal, speech of, ii., 347; excitement caused by, ii., 349; scene with the Pope, ii., 350; votes Placet, ii., 402.

Guillemin, the Crusader, anecdote of i., 97; death and posthumous honours, i., 205-207.

Harmonious laws, meaning of the term, i., 79.

Hefele, Bishop of Rottenburg, gives confused advice, ii., 59; on Pope Honorius, ii., 256; states the dilemma prepared by the Pope for the bishops of the minority, ii., 371.

Hergenröther, among the men whom Schwarzenberg deemed weak, i., 260; held up in England as an authority, *id.*; asserts that bishops in Vatican Council had freedom of proposition, ii., 58; his *Anti-Janus*, ii., 142.

History, official, how written, ii., 357, 358.

Hohenlohe, Cardinal, his dinner parties, ii., 164 ff.

Hohenlohe, Prince, minister of Bavaria, his circular to cabinets, i., 264.

Hyacinth, Father, i., 290.

Italians, excommunicated, i., 39; abused, i., 272, 273, 309; ii., 148.

Italy in 1846, i., 8; again in 1848, i., 9; in 1854, i., 36; in 1862, i., 42; in 1867, i., 111, 112.

Immaculate Conception, effects of the proclamation upon polity, i., 8.

Immunity, purport of, i., 49, 64, 67; of divine right, i., 274.

Indulgences, i., 267.

Infallibility, foreshadowed, i., 261; address in favour of, ii., 149; counter address, ii., 151; opposed on principle, ii., 152; decision to bring it forward, ii., 231; new doctrine in many sees, ii., 262; danger of, to States, hinted by bishops, ii., 265; to be brought on out of order, ii., 286; responsibility for, disowned by many bishops, ii., 288.

Inquisitor, a canonised, i., 99, 170.

Instruction, freedom of, illustrated, i., 18 ff.

Isabella, Queen of Spain, promises to Pope armed aid, i., 251; receives the golden rose, i., 255.

Janus i., 261, 285.

Jesuits, morals of, ii., 162.

Jong, Peter, the Crusader, his martyrdom, i., 219.

Kenrick, Archbishop of St. Louis, on the committees, ii., 73; speaks, ii., 101; shows how the conclusion to the first decree was passed, ii., 248; on infallibility, ii., 295; questions catholicity of the Council, ii., 297; refutes Cullen, ii., 309; on why British government conceded Catholic emancipation, ii., 327; on oaths and declarations, ii., 331; describes first teaching of infallibility in Maynooth, ii., 315.

Ketteler, Bishop of Mainz, his manifesto, i., 321; his table talk, ii., 168.

Kings, subordinate to ecclesiastical authority, i., 23, 24, 29, 49, 51, 52, 53, 60, 64, 67, 68, 69, 200, 279, 294;

not to be tolerated after Council, if they do not rightly govern, i., 397; ii., 189; two in every Catholic country, i., 63, 67, 197, 279, 294, 296; not to be convoked to the Council, i., 199, 262.

Kleutgen, the Jesuit, story of, ii., 286.

Laveleye, Professor, on two kings in one State, i., 294.

Lay States deprecated, i., 118.

LEDUCHOWSKI made Primate of Poland and representative of King of Poland, ii., 238.

Liberal Catholics, first used and then cast off, i., 224; policy of, i., 99; denounced, i., 58, 61, 62, 282, 308, 322; condemned under the head of naturalism, i., 62; ii., 116.

Liberalism condemned, i., 55, 58, 61, 62, 273; ii., 355.

Liberty of the Press condemned, i., 38, 115, 230 ff.

Liberty, religious, the Ultramontane view of, i., 32; i., 59; is a plague, i., 38, 232.

LIVERANI, Prelate and Protonotary of the Holy See, on Papal States, i., 8; on morals of the Court, i., 161; and of the city, 162.

Majority, as a rule of faith new, ii., 222.

MAMIANI, Count, on the probable effects of the Council, i., 247.

MANNING, Cardinal, his account of the confirmation of the Syllabus, i., 161, 176; on the consequences to civil authorities, i., 177; cites Tarquini as a mild modern teacher, i., 314; his manifesto, i., 380; he finds the Papal Church not narrow enough, i., 331; replied to by Friedrich, i., 336; Vitelleschi on, ii., 37, 45, 150; his testimony to the decorum and freedom of the Council, ii., 251; his speech on infallibility, ii., 325; confuted by Kenrick, *id.*; on deputation to Pope to harden his heart, ii., 381; present from his fellow labourers the Jesuits, ii., 411.

MARET, Bishop of Sora, his work, i., 287; reviewed by Schulte, i., 289.

MARGOTTI, Don, editor of *Unità Cattolica*, on Ollivier, ii., 147.

Marriage, a source of revenues and power, i., 75; ii., 18.

MENZEL, Professor, forecasts of doctrinal change, i., 251.

MENZEL, Wolfgang, cited in two or three places.

MICHAUD, Abbé, takes part in the debate on the lawfulness of absolving a Liberal prince, i., 230; on changes of catechism, ii., 216.

Military spectacle for bishops, ii., 53.

MILTON on Romish ceremonies, ii., 39.

MINORITY, annoyances of, ii., 210; proposal that they should quit the Council after guile practised on July 5th, ii., 364; flight of, ii., 389; represented more Catholics than majority, ii., 328.

MONTALEMBERT, on the reaction of 1852 and years following, i., 27, 100; opposes Italy, i., 39; on new Ultramontanism, i., 100; his posthumous work, i., 222; traces ruin of Spain to absolutism and the Inquisition, i., 267; his strong opposition to infallibility, i., 280; his dying manifesto, i., 240; Pope forbids a high mass for him, i., 242.

MORENO GARCIA, President of Ecuadore, a model ruler, i., 349.

MORTAL SIN, a new one, ii., 145.

MUNICH, replies of Faculties of Theology and Law to the questions of the king, i., 259.

NAPOLÉON III., policy of, i., 343.

NATIONALISM a fault, i., 102.

NATURALISM a heresy which includes two degrees of Liberal Catholicism, i., 62; ii., 116.

NATURAL ORDER and SUPERNATURAL ORDER, illustration of the terms, i., 79, 80.

NEWMAN, Dr., on the Syllabus, i., 183 ff.; declines invitation to Rome, i., 198; his alarm at the prospect of the new dogma, ii., 267; rallied and exorcised by the *Civiltà*, ii., 271; retort of Veuillot upon, ii., 272.

OCCHINO, Bernardino, on the Papacy, ii., 42.

O'CONNELL on the doctrine of Papists properly so called, i., 179.

OLLIVIER, Emile, Prime Minister of France, policy of, i., 344, 345; his proper course prescribed by Veuillot, ii., 139; changes the policy inaugurated by Daru, ii., 212.

OPPOSITION, the existence of, denied, ii., 51; its existence confessed, ii., 52; efforts to disorganize, ii., 73, 168; found so grave that it must be put down, ii., 157.

Orientals invited to Council, i., 209 ; their response, i., 211-215.

Papacy, a universal monarchy, and over all princes, i., 47, 49, 51, 52, 173, 210, 280 ; ii., 202, 203 ; crimes of, against Italy, ii., 434.

Papal States, the model state for the whole world, i., 116 ff., 277; ii., 354 ; no wrong act can be done in them by authority, i., 117 ; plains of, i., 123 ; dwellings of, i., 123 ; people of, i., 124 ; villages of, i., 125 ; implements, cattle, and towns, 125-140 ; classes, 143-145 ; culture, 148 ; moral character of capital, 158.

Parliamentary government decried, i., 273, 278, 308, 395 ; ii., 148, 206.

Parliament, English and Irish members of, are to have obligations imposed, ii., 466.

Perfect Society, the Church a, i., 49 ; Tarquinii's doctrine of, i., 314-332.

Petitions and protests of bishops of the minority, ii., 55, 111, 113, 154, 155, 221, 261.

Pius IX., his States disturbed, i., 8 ; witnesses general commotions, i., 9 ; calls for armed aid, i., 9 ; undertakes to reconstruct society, i., 10, 46, 47 ; his first dogma, i., 39 ; his jubilee of priesthood, i., 277 ; his sayings previous to the Council, i., 341, 342 ; his liberality, i., 354 ; speech against the Opposition, ii., 137 ; refuses to receive address of 130 bishops, ii., 153 ; writes against bishops, ii., 179 ; excites their clergy against them, ii., 209 ; his chat, ii., 225 ; self-importance, ii., 230 ; further letters, ii., 236 ; forbids a High Mass for Montalembert, ii., 242 ; gives no access to the minority, ii., 289 ; approves of Saldanha for rebelling against his king, ii., 324 ; severity to bishops as to health, ii., 338 ; his tergiversation, ii., 379 ; offers to mediate between France and Prussia, ii., 420 ; how he likes to be addressed, ii., 421 ; appeals to King William for help, ii., 427 ; hoists white flag, ii., 429 ; foretells his restoration, ii., 478 ; re-opens the Roman Question, ii., 490.

Placet, royal, Tarquinii's doctrine of, i., 30 ff.

Plantier, Bishop of Nîmes, repudiates the idea that a Liberal prince may be absolved, i., 228 ; favours an ac-

clamation and dogmatising of the Assumption of the Virgin, i., 299.

Politics included in morals, i., 19.

Pope, sitting as supreme judge of princes and of laws, i., 47, 51, 298 ; the Word of God, i., 351 ; the living Christ, i., 352 ; the image of the Father, i., 352 ; Abraham, Moses, and Christ, i., 394 ; Cæsar, ii., 136, 414 ; head of statesmen, ii., 207 ; intercessor between God and the World, ii., 347 ; continues the work of Christ on earth, ii., 356 ; head of both spiritual and temporal power, i., 62, 53, 68 ; can depose kings, i., 68, 70 ; head of the human species, i., 113 ; fountain of water of life, ii., 421 ; has the authority of God, ii., 421.

Press, is Satan, ii., 52 ; correspondents of, lampooned, ii., 94 ; contradictions of, ii., 97.

Priests, disfranchised, i., 263 ; mobilised, i., 269.

Primacy, stretching of the term, i., 108.

Private judgment, i., 121.

Procedure, Method of, in the Vatican Council, ii., 84, 106, 106, 144, 220, 361, 372, 382, 398.

Pro-synodal congregations, i., 369.

Protestantism not a negation, ii., 365.

Protestants, letters of invitation to, i., 217.

Pusey, Dr., valued as an ally by continental priests, i., 326 ; ii., 179.

Quatrebabes, Bernard, the Crusader, ii., 390.

Quélen, Count, the Crusader, i., 205.

Quirinus, who was he ? i., 194.

Ranke, notion of, that the Papacy had changed, i., 53.

Rauscher, Cardinal, opens discussion, ii., 101 ; laughed at by the majority, ii., 291 ; his argument on infallibility, ii., 293-295, 346.

Reconstruction of society, i., 46, 249.

Reform of Church in Head and Members, i., 242.

Regulars, uses of, to Papacy, i., 102, 103.

Reissach, Cardinal, head of commission for ecclesiastico-political affairs, i., 194 ; his proposed code, i., 195 ; appointed President of Council, i., 370 ; death, ii., 89 ; his code suppressed, ii., 91.

Renan, his view of intolerance as essential to the Church approved at Rome, as against that of the Liberal Catholics, i., 223, 231, 236.

Rome, changes in, i., 110; street lighting a ceremony, i., 110; mid-day in, i., 111; as seen by Veuillot, i., 112; city of the saints, i., 160; moral condition of, i., 161; is modern to Orientals, i., 215; is the city of three devotions, ii., 250.

Rosary, its military virtues, i., 360; it destroyed the Albigenses, i., 361; it gained the victory of Lepanto, i., 361; its part in the battle of Bagnoara, i., 364.

Saints, new, i., 41, 170.

Segesser, his plan of reform, ii., 70.

Senestrey, Bishop of Regensburg, speech of, at Schwandorf, i., 271; tales of, ii., 167; Manning's comrade on the deputation to harden the Pope's heart, ii., 381.

Schoolmen, their methods for all time, i., 57.

Schrader, Father, the Jesuit, sent to Vienna, i., 55; his works, i., 56; cited against Newman, i., 188; on infallibility, ii., 184; his propositions, i., 401.

Schwarzenberg complains of the theologians selected, i., 260; his reception of Sepp, i., 302; interrupted while speaking, ii., 252; on infallibility, ii., 307.

Science, homage of, to Pope, i., 348; ii., 218.

Sibour, Archbishop of Paris, on new Ultramontanism, i., 100.

Society, the Pope the saviour of, i., 210, 277, 291; ii., 207, 416.

Soglia, his doctrine according to Newman, i., 188; his real doctrine, i., 192.

State, subordinate to Church, i., 50, 51, 52, 60, 67, 117, 275; ii., 80, 189, 202.

Stimmen aus Maria Laach anticipates political transformations, i., 271; on religious liberty, i., 281.

Strossmayer, attempts to speak on the Rules, ii., 72; called to order, ii., 106; extract of speech, ii., 107; on the official reports, ii., 108.

Stumpf on religious liberty and on the freedom of the lawgiver from the command of the priest, i., 308-312.

Subjects more the subjects of the Pope than of their own sovereign, i., 67, 279, 294, 296.

Sunbeams, doctrinal value of, i., 3, 389.

Sword, doctrine of, i., 192, 237, 362; *see also CRUSADE OF ST. PETER.*

Syllabus, issue of, i., 7; contents of, i., 51 ff.; summary of its effects, i., 71; confirmed by Pope, i., 163; accepted by collective episcopate, i., 167; Manning's account of its confirmation, i., 175; cited by *Cirilitá*, i., 234; not the work of the Pope according to Dr. Newman, i., 185; Vatican Decrees as prepared for the Council follow its outlines, ii.

Table-talk, during the Council, ii., 164 ff.

Taigi, Anna Maria, the new guardian of the Capitol, i., 367.

Tarquini, Cardinal, a Jesuit, when a Professor hailed by Pius IX., i., 28; his doctrine of king and Pope, i., 29 ff.; cited by Manning as a mild modern teacher, i., 314; his doctrine of the Perfect Society, i., 314-322; his doctrine of the sword, i., 362 ff.

Temporal authority of princes an inferior authority to the ecclesiastical, i., 69.

Temporal power of Pope necessary to his spiritual office, i., 44, 167.

Theiner, Augustinc, Prefect of the Vatican Archives, forbidden to show documents to bishops or theologians, ii., 122; his unsuccessful attempt to see Lord Guildford's MSS., *id.*; his dismissal, ii., 340.

Theocracy, contrast between the Mosiac and the Papal, i., 25.

Theologians, excluded from Vatican Council, ii., 48; forbidden to meet or consult together, ii., 50; attainments of Roman, ii., 84.

Third party, attempt to form, ii., 210.

toleration, when to be allowed, i., 39.

Tribunals, the internal, external, and supreme, i., 48; ii., 304, 448.

Ultramontanism, difference between old and new, i., 100, 101; henceforth to be the whole Church, ii., 97.

Unità Cattolica, specimens of its opinions, i., 269; abuse of Italy, i., 273; wants a Chamber of Jesuits, i., 275.

Unity, Romish notion of, i., 276.

Veuillot, Louis, editor of *Univers*, a

layman, on the grand results to be expected, i., 113, 114, 115; on the press, i., 115; twits journalists, i., 248; wants bishops for Prefects of Provinces, i., 395; sees in the future only 'the Pope and the People,' i., 397; would not have ancient aristocracy restored, ii., 94-95; abuses correspondents of papers, ii., 95; lays down a policy for France, ii., 139; gives glory to M. Olivier, ii., 212; his *true* account of the scene between the Pope and the Patriarch of Babylon, ii., 215; watches the minority, ii., 393.

Vicar of Christ, the office described, ii., 356.

Virgin, the letter of, on infallibility, ii., 307.

Vitelleschi, origin of his book, ii., 98; attacked in vain by the *Critica*, ii., 98; his view of the practical scope of infallibility, ii., 267.

War, anticipations or threats of, i., 108, 114, 305, 307; ii., 81, 90, 135, 195, 205, 257, 299, 377, 442.

Watts-Russell, the Crusader, ii. 352.

Youth, Catholic, manifestoes of, ii., 97, 191.

FINIS.

